

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-249]

**Commonwealth Edison Co.;
Environmental Assessment and
Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain testing requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 to the Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo) (the licensee) for Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 3 located at the licensee's site in Grundy County, Illinois.

Environmental Assessment*Identification of Proposed Action*

The proposed action would grant an exemption from certain requirements of Appendix J to 10 CFR Part 50 for type B and C testing of certain valves, vents, drains, sumps and penetrations which maintain containment integrity at design bases accident conditions. The exemption is strictly scheduled in that it would allow a 30-day extension of the 2-year test interval for the above components required by Appendix J.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The licensee shut down for its Cycle 9 refueling outage on September 30, 1983 and was scheduled to shut down for its Cycle 10 refueling outage in the Spring of 1985. However, because of an unanticipated 4-month outage extension in 1984, the shutdown for refueling and other modifications has been extended to October 26, 1985. This will cause CECo to exceed the 2-year test interval required by Appendix J for type B and C testing of certain components.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption affects only the interval between the test of certain components required to assure containment integrity. Because the operational period of these components will be shortened due to the aforementioned 4-month Cycle 9 refueling outage extension, the operational challenge to these components has been less than usually occurs in the 2-year test interval. Thus, post-accident radiological releases will not differ from those determined previously and the proposed exemption does not otherwise affect facility radiological effluent or occupational exposures. With regard to potential

nonradiological impacts, the proposed exemption does not affect plant nonradiological effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes there are no measurable radiological or nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed exemption, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. The principal alternative to the exemption would be to require rigid compliance with the Appendix J requirements. Such action would not enhance the protection of the environment and would result in unjustified costs.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not considered previously in the Final Environmental Statement for Dresden Unit 3.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

The NRC staff reviewed the licensee's request and did not consult other agencies or persons.

Finding of No Significant Impact

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption. Based upon the environmental assessment, the NRC staff concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated August 16, 1985. This letter is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street NW., Washington, D.C. and at the Morris Public Library, 604 Liberty Street, Morris, Illinois 60451.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this 20th day of September 1985.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
Dennis M. Crutchfield,

*Assistant Director for Safety Assessment,
Division of Licensing.*

[FR Doc. 85-22920 Filed 9-24-85; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

**Advisory Committee on Reactor
Safeguards, Subcommittee on Davis-
Besse Nuclear Station Unit 1; Meeting**

The ACRS Subcommittee on Davis-

Besse Nuclear Station Unit 1 will hold a meeting on October 4, 1985, at the Davis-Besse Administration Building, Route 2 Oak Harbor, Ohio.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows: *Friday, October 4, 1985—1:00 p.m. until the conclusion of business.*

The Subcommittee will review actions taken prior to restarting following the loss of feedwater incident and other related matters.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting when a transcript is being kept, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and Staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the ACRS staff member named below as far in advance as is practicable so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittee will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the Toledo Edison Company, NRC Staff, their consultants, and other interested persons regarding this review.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been cancelled or rescheduled, the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by a prepaid telephone call to the cognizant ACRS staff member, Mr. Herman Alderman (telephone 202/634-1414) between 8:15 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual one or two days before the scheduled meeting to be advised of any changes in schedule, etc., which may have occurred.

Morton W. Libarkin,
Assistant Executive Director for Project Review.

[FR Doc. 85-22921 Filed 9-24-85; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Bi-Weekly Notice; Applications and Amendments To Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations**I. Background**

Pursuant to Public Law (Pub. L.) 97-415, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is publishing this regular bi-weekly notice. Pub. L. 97-415 revised section 189 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), to require the Commission to publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, under a new provision of section 189 of the Act. This provision grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This bi-weekly notice includes all amendments issued, or proposed to be issued, since the date of publication of the last bi-weekly notice which was published on September 11, 1985 (50 FR 37072), through September 16, 1985.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination. The Commission will not normally make a final determination unless it receives a request for a hearing.

Comments should be addressed to the Rules and Procedures Branch, Division of Rules and Records, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Comments may also be delivered to Room 4000, Maryland National Bank Building, Bethesda, Maryland from 8:15 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

By October 25, 1985, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of

the amendment under consideration. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment.

If the final determination is that the amendment involves a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendment before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received before action is taken. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free

telephone call to Western Union at (800) 325-6000 (in Missouri (800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message addressed to (*Branch Chief*): petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this *Federal Register* notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Executive Legal Director, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petition for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request, that the petition has made a substantial showing of good cause for the granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Docket No. 50-318, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 2, Calvert County, Maryland

Date of applications for amendment: August 29 and August 30, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Unit 2 Technical Specifications (TS) to reflect analyses performed in support of Cycle 7 operation.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: On April 6, 1985 the NRC published guidance in the *Federal Register* (48 FR 14870) concerning examples of amendments that are not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. One such example (iii) involves "For a nuclear power reactor, a change resulting from a nuclear reactor core reloading, if no fuel assemblies significantly different from those found previously acceptable to the NRC for a previous core at the facility in question are involved. This assumes that no significant changes are made to the acceptance criteria for the technical specifications, that the analytical methods used to demonstrate

conformance with technical specifications and regulations are not significantly changed, and that NRC has previously found such methods acceptable."

The proposed changes to the Unit 2 TS, submitted by applications dated August 29 and August 30, 1985 satisfy the criteria of example (iii). Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes to the TS required for Unit 2 Cycle 7 operation involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Calvert County Library, Prince Frederick Maryland.

Attorney for licensee: George F. Trowbridge, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20328

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher, Acting.

Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth, Massachusetts

Date of amendment request: August 9, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TS) as follows:

(1) In Table 3.1.1, "Reactor Protection System (SCRAM) Instrumentation Requirement", the footnote associated with the APRM high flux scram setpoint would be changed to match the value for this setting in TS 2.1.A.1.a, "Fuel Cladding Integrity" and on Figure 3.11-9, "Pilgrim Power/Flow Map." The need for this change was missed when the latter were changed by Amendment No. 72.

(2) Note reference (13) would be placed in Table 3.1.1 in the "Trip Level Setting" column at the "APRM Inoperative" line. The licensee states that this reference was inadvertently deleted during issuance of Amendment No. 15.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning application of the standards by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One example of an amendment considered not likely to involve significant hazard considerations is "(i) a purely administrative change to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency through the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature." Proposed change (1) above is encompassed by this example since it is intended to achieve consistency in the TS. The second change, (2), would restore a reference to

a note, still in the TS, which defines the term "APRM Inoperative". Since no requirements or conditions would be affected by restoration of the reference, this change would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (2) create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin safety.

Therefore, the staff has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, 11 North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

Attorney for licensee: W. S. Stowe, Esq., Boston Edison Company, 800 Boylston Street, 36th Floor, Boston, Massachusetts 02199.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Carolina Power & Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendment: August 12, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, by revising the surveillance requirements for them suppression pool cooling mode of the Residual Heat Removal (RHR) System.

The surveillance requirements for the suppression pool cooling mode of the RHR system, TS 4.8.2.2.b, currently require verification "that each RHR pump can be started from the control room and develops a flow of at least 10,300 gpm against a system head corresponding to a reactor pressure of greater than or equal to 20 psig on recirculation flow."

The current surveillance requirement is modeled after an In-Service Inspection requirement for a full-flow test. The system is tested during normal plant operation by taking suction from the suppression pool and returning the water to the pool through a test line. Each pump must develop a flow of 10,300 gpm to satisfy the test requirement. The RHR heat exchanger must be bypassed during this test as flow through the RHR heat exchanger is limited to 7,700 gpm to prevent damage to the heat exchanger tubing.

A more accurate method of verifying operability of the RHR pumps in the suppression pool cooling mode is to

route the recirculation flow through the RHR heat exchanger (as in actual operation), since the flow path in this mode of operation is from the torus, through the RHR heat exchanger, and then back to the torus.

Therefore, the proposed TS requires that each RHR pump produces a recirculation flow of at least 7,700 gpm through the RHR heat exchanger to the suppression pool. The proposed TS follows the guidance provided by NUREG-0123, Standard Technical Specifications for Boiling Water Reactors (STB) by routing flow through the RHR heat exchanger during the surveillance test.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Carolina Power & Light Company has determined that the requested amendment per 10 CFR 50.92:

(1) Does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because the proposed amendment only modifies the surveillance requirement. No changes are made to the design, function, operating parameters, operating procedures or setpoints to any plant system.

(2) Does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than previously evaluated for the same reasons as already given in item (1) above.

(3) Does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The proposed surveillance requirement provides a better indication of actual system performance by including the RHR heat exchanger in the test loop. The modified requirement is more consistent with the guidance provided in NUREG-0123, the STB. Also, the requirements of the surveillance are more clearly stated. The margin of safety, therefore, is maintained.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's determination and finds it acceptable. Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed amendment meets the criteria of 10 CFR

50.92(c) and, therefore, does not involve significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Southport, Brunswick County Library, 109 W. Moore Street, Southport, North Carolina 28461.

Attorney for licensee: George F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Carolina Power & Light Company,
Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324,
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1
and 2, Brunswick County, North
Carolina

Date of application for amendment:
August 28, 1985.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would change the Technical Specifications (TS) for the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2 to revise the rated thermal power range over which the Rod Block Monitor (RBM) channels must be operable.

The Rod Worth Minimizer (RWM) and Rod Sequence Control System (RSCS) are redundant systems which assure that out-of-sequence control rods will not be withdrawn or inserted during low-level power operation. Control rod withdrawal sequences are established (based on rod worth) to assure that in the event of a control rod drop accident, the fuel peak enthalpy does not exceed 280 cal/gm. At greater than 20 percent of rated thermal power, no rod has sufficient worth such that, if it were to drop, the peak enthalpy would exceed 280 cal/gm. Therefore, the RWM and RSCS need be operable only when the plant is operating at less than 20 percent of rated thermal power.

Currently, TS 3.1.4.3 requires both RBM channels to be operable when thermal power is greater than the preset power level of the RWM and the RSCS (approximately 30 percent nominal rated thermal power). In addition, this specification requires that the RBM and the RWM and RSCS operationally overlap when approaching this power level to ensure meeting the requirements of the TS. However, based on the information discussed previously, the design intent and power levels over which the systems are required are very different; RWM and RSCS are designed for low power levels, and RBM is designed for high power levels. Therefore, no overlap is necessary.

The RBM is designed to operate at high power levels. Currently, the RBM is bypassed when the Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) used to normalize the RBM reading is indicating less than 30 percent power. The

proposed revision to the TS would require the RBM to be operable when thermal power is greater than or equal to 35 percent of rated thermal power. This setpoint was conservatively chosen to ensure that: (1) A clear, concise power level is designated by the TS for plant operations; (2) the RBM functions as designed; (3) the RBM is operable as required by the TS using existing plant setpoints; and (4) the margin of safety is not reduced.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:
The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from accidents previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Carolina Power & Light Company has determined that the requested amendment per 10 CFR 50.92(c):

3. Does not involve a significant increase in the probability of consequences of an accident previously evaluated because this change merely clarifies the power level at which the RBM is required to be operable. The proposed TS changes the current setpoint to 35 percent of rated thermal power which is still well below the high power level at which the RBM is required to operate; therefore, neither the RBM design and function, nor the accident analyses that use the RBM have been changed.

2. Does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident than previously evaluated for the same reason as stated in 1 above.

Does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. None of the actual plant operating setpoints will be changed as a result of the proposed TS. Only the power level at which the RBM is required to be operable, as specified by the TS, will be clarified; this change is consistent with the guidelines set forth in NUREG-0123, the Standard Technical Specifications.

The staff has reviewed the licensee's determination and finds it acceptable. Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed change meets the criteria of 10 CFR 50.92(c) and, therefore, does not involve significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room

location: Southport, Brunswick County Library, 109 W. Moore Street, Southport, North Carolina 28461.

Attorney for licensee: George E. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Commonwealth Edison Company,
Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374, La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2, La Salle County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: August 19, 1985 as supplemented by letter dated September 5, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments to Operating License NPF-11 and Operating License NPF-18 would revise the setpoints and setpoint tolerances for the 18 safety relief valves (SRVs) in the Technical Specifications for each of La Salle, Units 1 and 2. The Commonwealth Edison Company (licensee) indicates that the present values of setpoints and setpoint tolerances are too restrictive. The General Electric Company (the vendor) specifications indicate that the setpoint tolerances can be changed from $\pm 1\%$ to a revised value of $+1\%$ to -3% and still be consistent with the specifications because the test data of the La Salle SRVs gave a nameplate rating of $+1\%$, -3% by ASME rating. The ASME rating practice requires an approved, preheated test loop where the accuracies are demonstrated. This is performed by preheating the SRV to be tested in the loop, then testing the SRV four times in a row. These four readings must fall within a 4% scatterband or the valve is rejected. Therefore, by definition, the $+1\%$ and -3% is the apportionment of the 4% scatterband that is designed for the valves at La Salle, and defines the nameplate setting of the SRVs.

The essential function of the 18 safety relief valves for each unit is the protection of the primary system from overpressure. Since the upper tolerance band remains the same, the safety margin remains unchanged within the system since the upper limit where the SRV will open has the same tolerance. In addition, the implication of retaining a lower bound of -1% on the SRV setpoint is the possibility of unnecessary testing of valves. By the original Technical Specifications, if any of the valves fails to meet the $\pm 1\%$ set pressure tolerance, an additional sample of valves must be removed and tested. If any of these valves fail, then the remainder of the valves must be removed and tested. This would

unnecessarily increase the length of the time the unit is shutdown and would also increase the man-rem exposure during the additional valve removals and installation.

Presently, the setpoints for these safety relief valves are as follows: 4 at 1205 psig, 4 at 1195 psig, 4 at 1185 psig, 4 at 1175 psig, and 2 at 1146 psig. The licensee is proposing that the setpoints for the last safety relief valves be changed from 1146 to 1150 psig, because of revisions to GE design documents. This represents about a .4% increase in the lowest setpoint. This would have only a minor effect on the safety function of these valves, and the 1150 psig setpoint reflects General Electric design documents.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee has determined and the NRC Staff agrees that the proposed amendments will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because: The overpressure limit as previously analyzed is maintained. The safety valves will be maintained within the allowable limits of the design.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because: No safety relief valves are being removed. No new accident is postulated. Full overpressure protection is maintained.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because the ability of the safety relief valves to limit reactor pressure as required will be maintained in accordance with design requirements. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room
location: Public Library of Illinois Valley Community College, Rural Route No. 1, Ogelsby, Illinois 61348.

Attorney for licensee: Isham, Lincoln and Burke, Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.
NRC Branch Chief: Walter R. Butler.

Commonwealth Edison Company,
Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374, La Salle County Station, Units 1 and 2, La Salle County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: August 28, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments to operating License NPF-11 and Operating License NPF-18 would revise the La Salle, Units 1 and 2 Technical Specifications with respect to the average power range monitor (APRM) gain adjustment to allow time to correct calibrations before declaring the channels inoperable and requiring half-scam. The licensee is proposing an interpretation and clarification to provide 2 hours to correct APRMs which are less than 0.98 of the base line value during plant operation above 90 percent rated thermal power. At less than 90 percent rated thermal power, 2 hours would be allowed to correct APRMs exceeding 1.02 of the base line value and 12 hours to correct APRMs exceeding 10 percent of rated thermal power. A clarification is also proposed that would make it acceptable to trip only an inoperable channel where trip systems have more than 2 channels per system.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee has determined and the NRC staff agrees that the proposed amendments will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because this change simply allows a more realistic time period to correct APRM calibration before reactor trip is required. The APRM channel setpoints will be maintained within required limits or restored to proper limits with the time limits consistent with other specifications.

(2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because no change in the APRM scram function is included in this amendment.

(3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because the change does not allow the APRMs to be set non-conservatively. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room

Location: Public Library of Illinois Valley Community College, Rural Route No. 1, Ogelsby, Illinois 61348.

Attorney for licensee: Isham, Lincoln and Burke, Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: W. R. Butler.

Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 50-374, La Salle County Station, Unit 2, La Salle County, Illinois.

Date of amendment request: August 28, 1985.

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendment to Operating License NPR-18 would revise the La Salle Unit 2 Technical Specifications for a one-time technical specification relief during the La Salle Unit 1 first refueling outage to extend the present three-day or seven-day period to thirty days during which only three diesel generators would be required to satisfy the standby AC on-site power requirements for Unit 2. This one time change will allow the installation of the diesel generator lube oil modification required by license condition to be installed on Unit 1 prior to startup after the first refueling for the common diesel generators "O" and "1A". Because the "O" and "1A" are shared between the two units and existing Technical Specifications 3.8.1.1 require these diesel generators be operable whenever either unit is in operation, the licensee is unable to perform the modification without bringing both Units to shutdown. The licensee indicates in its application that the proposed Technical Specifications are justifiable because:

1. The probability that a station blackout will occur during the 30 days is extremely unlikely.

2. The operating unit can be safely shutdown following a loss of off-site power transient even if one of the remaining diesels fails. In addition to the above, the licensee contends that the La Salle diesels have a higher than average reliability. The average emergency diesel generator has a reliability of 0.98 and those at La Salle have a reliability that exceed 0.99.

Basis of proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92 (c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The licensee has determined and the NRC staff agrees that the proposed amendment will not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because in the event of a loss of offsite power with the "O" or "1A" diesel inoperable for this period sufficient onsite power with a single active failure will still be available to safely shutdown.

2. Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because emergency power is still available to those systems required to mitigate accidents evaluated in the FSAR.

3. Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because the probability of a loss of offsite power in addition to a remaining diesel generator failure during the period of these diesel generator modifications is sufficiently small to reasonably assure the health and safety of the public.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed changes to the Technical Specifications involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room

location: Public Library of Illinois Valley Community College, Rural Route No. 1, Ogelsby, Illinois 61348.

Attorney for licensee: Isham, Lincoln and Burke, Suite 840, 1120 Connecticut Ave, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Walter R. Butler.

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Docket No. 50-247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: August 2, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications to establish limiting conditions for operation (LCO's) and surveillance requirements for the Alternate Safe Shutdown System of

Indian Point Unit No. 2. The proposed Technical Specifications were directly requested by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Generic Letter 81-12 dated February 20, 1981. This amendment application supersedes Consolidated Edison's August 7, 1981 application concerning the same subject.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a no significant hazards determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of an amendment not likely to involve significant hazards considerations is a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The staff proposes to determine that this change does not involve a significant hazards determination because it consists of additional requirements not currently in the Technical Specifications and is submitted to conform Indian Point Unit 2 to current NRC requirements.

Local Public Document Room

location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York, 10610.

Attorney for licensee: Brent L. Brandenburg, Esq., 4 Irving Place, New York, New York 10003.

Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Docket No 50-247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: August 6, 1985.

Description of amendment request:

The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications to include anticipatory reactor trip upon turbine trip. The proposed change was directly requested by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by Generic Letter dated September 20, 1982, and is required to satisfy NUREG-0737 "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements" Item II.K.3.12. In addition the amendment application requests a modification to bypass (block) the anticipatory reactor trip upon turbine trip below 35% power. The 35% power level was chosen because at this level the elimination of reactor trip on turbine trip will not challenge the pressurizer Power Operated Relief Valves (PORV's) and essentially will not challenge the probability of a small-break LOCA resulting from a stuck-open pressurizer PORV. The purpose of the modification is to increase plant availability by reducing the length of time required to

restart the unit following a readily correctable turbine trip at low power.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for a no significant hazards determination by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (ii) of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration relates to changes that constitute additional restrictions or controls not presently included in the Technical Specifications. The staff proposes to determine that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazards consideration since it consists of an additional limitation on operation of the facility not currently in the Technical Specifications. Although Consolidated Edison has requested a modification to bypass the reactor trip upon turbine trip below 35% power, this still constitutes an additional limitation on operation of the facility not currently in the Technical Specifications.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York, 10610.

Attorney for licensee: Brent L. Brandenburg, Esq., 4 Irving Place, New York, New York 10003.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.
Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Docket No. 50-247, Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: August 6, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment to the Technical Specifications includes revisions to further limit the use of the containment purge and vent isolation valves during power operation. This amendment was directly requested by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission by letters dated September 29, 1983 and June 17, 1985. The proposed amendment also clarifies associated requirements in Technical Specification 3.6 relating to the application of containment isolation action statements. Minor format and editorial changes are also included.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). Example (ii) of those involving no significant hazards considerations discusses a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the

technical specification: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement. The proposed revision to specification 3.6.A adds limiting conditions for operation (LCOs) relative to the containment purge and pressure relief isolation valves and is consistent with example (ii) in that the proposed change constitutes an additional limitation not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

Consistent with the Commission's criteria for determining whether a proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards considerations, 10 CFR 50.92 (48 FR 14871), the proposed revision to Specification 3.6.A relating to containment isolation provision action requirements and the editorial and format changes will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated; or involve a significant reduction in margin of safety. The proposed revisions are solely intended to provide clarifying guidance for the specification's applicability; thereby eliminating the potential for inappropriate or incorrect interpretation. The editorial and format changes are for administrative purposes only.

Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York, 10610.

Attorney for licensee: Brent L. Brandenburg, Esq., 4 Irving Place, New York, New York 10003.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.
Duke Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-369 and 50-370, McGuire Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, Mecklenburg County, North Carolina

Date of amendment requests: October 31, 1984, and July 15, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would change the Technical Specifications for interior groundwater monitors to provide consistency between the Technical Specifications and the as-built capabilities of the Groundwater Monitoring System. The interior groundwater monitors are installed so as to detect and alarm exterior groundwater at a level 2'8" above the top of floor slabs at various locations. The current Technical Specifications require the interior groundwater monitors to detect groundwater at a level corresponding to the top of these

floor slabs and to alarm 2'0" above that level. The proposed amendments would, therefore, change Technical Specification 3/4.7.13 and referenced Specification Table 3.7-7 such that the initial alarm and lower detection and control level for interior monitors is 2'8" above the monitored floor level. A second alarm level at 5'0" above floor level and a third at 15'0" above floor level would not be changed by the proposed amendments. Specification 3.7.13 would also be clarified to indicate that its ACTION statements (requiring that the reactor be placed in hot standby or cold shutdown) are not applicable when the reactor is in Mode 5 (cold shutdown) or Mode 6 (refueling).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Specification 3.7.13.d requires that various actions, the selection of which depends upon the rate of rise of groundwater level, be implemented if groundwater levels rise above specified allowable levels. The results of the Technical Specification change would be to reduce by eight inches the groundwater level interval that would be available after the initial alarm to determine the rate of rise (and, hence, the appropriate action) as required by Technical Specification 3.7.13.d. By letter dated July 15, 1985, the licensee discussed the result of its analysis which finds that with the reduced interval, there would still be ample time available to make the required determinations of groundwater rate of rise and take appropriate actions. Specifically, the licensee's analysis indicates that approximately 10 minutes would be needed by an operator to respond to a groundwater level alarm and take appropriate actions, whereas the installed detection range and setpoints of the interior groundwater monitors are such that in excess of 19 hours would be available to the operator. The Commission's preliminary review supports the licensee's analysis and conclusions that there would, therefore, be no impact on operator response time and that the amount of response time continues to allow operators time to take required actions without jeopardizing any safety margins.

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether license amendments involve significant hazards consideration by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The proposed amendments do not match the examples. However, the Commission has reviewed the licensee's request for the above amendments and has determined that should this request be

implemented, it would not: (1) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because the proposed changes concern only monitoring instrumentation and setpoints which provide information to plant staff to assess the need for and take timely action, and do not otherwise result in a change in any equipment, procedure or specified action. The proposed amendments also would not (2) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety because, as discussed above, ample operator response time remains available. Similarly, the proposed amendment to the action statement requiring hot standby or cold shutdown which would indicate that the action statement is not applicable when the reactor is already in a shutdown condition is simply a clarification and will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated, will not create a new accident different from any previously evaluated, and will not involve a significant reduction in any margin of safety. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the proposed amendments do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Atkins Library, University of North Carolina, Charlotte (UNCC Station), North Carolina 28223

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Albert Carr, Duke Power Company, P.O. Box 33189, 422 South Church Street, Charlotte, North Carolina 28242

NRC Branch Chief: Elinor G. Adensam.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-321, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: August 20, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would modify the Technical Specifications to add limiting conditions for operation, trip setpoints and surveillance requirements for the monitors which provide the high radiation isolation signals to the containment purge and vent valves.

The above proposed Technical Specification modifications were submitted to reflect implementation of NUREG-0737 Item ILE.4.2(7) which requires that the purge and vent valves

close automatically on a high containment radiation signal.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). An example of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is an amendment involving a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. These proposed Technical Specification modifications impose additional limitations, restrictions and controls and therefore fall within this example.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to an example for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room
location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Attorney for licensee: G. F. Trowbridge, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-321, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: August 23, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This amendment would modify the Technical Specifications to add limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for new Automatic Depressurization System (ADS) bypass timers.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). An example of actions involving no significant hazards considerations is Example (ii), an amendment involving a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications. ADS bypass timers are being added to Unit 1 to satisfy the requirements of NUREG-0737, Item ILE.3.18. These proposed Technical Specification modifications add operating and surveillance requirements

for these new ADS bypass timers and therefore fall within this example.

Therefore, since the application for amendment involves proposed changes that are similar to an example for which no significant hazards considerations exist, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room
location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Attorney for licensee: G. F. Trowbridge, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: May 9, 1985, as supplemented August 30, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The amendment would modify the Technical Specifications to remove the overcurrent trip setpoints and response time for the primary containment penetration conductor overcurrent protection breakers and remove reference to "testing at the specified setpoints" from the surveillance testing requirements. It would replace these trip setpoints and the corresponding surveillance requirements with a requirement that breakers be tested using the current specified in the applicable NEMA Standard, NEMA AB-2-1980.

The amendment would also correct an erroneous parts listing and revise two motor control center frame identification numbers.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The selection of the breaker and its setpoint is controlled and limited by the design requirement for protection of the

containment electrical penetration against damage due to overcurrent provided in Section 3.8.2 of the Hatch Unit 2 FSAR. As a practical matter, the breaker and its setpoint must also be selected to allow startup and normal operation of the electrical equipment that is powered through the electrical penetration. As a result, when electrical equipment is changed, the breaker and/or the setpoint may also be changed, and the setpoint may be higher or lower than that listed in the current TS. Thus, the margin between the trip overcurrent and the actual design overcurrent limit for electrical penetration may change when breaker setpoints are changed. However, the FSAR design requirements and the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59 concerning design changes will assure an adequate design margin of safety is maintained. The testing in accordance with the NEMA standard will assure that the breakers function as designed.

The reference to testing molded circuit breakers "at the specified setpoint" is incorrect. Correct testing of breakers requires injecting a current greater than the specified setpoint. Deletion of this requirement and replacing it with the requirement to test in accordance with the NEMA standard corrects this error. This is an administrative change.

The correction of erroneous parts listings and frame identification numbers is an administrative change.

On the basis of the above, the Commission's staff expects the proposed changes will not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Therefore, the Commission has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Dockets Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: August 23, 1985.

Description of amendment request: These amendments would modify the

Technical Specification tables of primary containment isolation valves for each unit to reflect drywell pneumatic system modifications. The modifications divide the original single drywell pneumatic header for each unit into two separate headers which penetrate the drywell at different locations. Each header supplies approximately half of the safety/relief valves (SRVs). For Unit 1, two additional isolation valves are added to reflect the addition of the new header. For Unit 2, two additional valves are added and a third valve that has now become unnecessary has been removed. The Technical Specification tables of containment isolation valves would be modified to add the two new valves for each unit and to delete the valve that is no longer needed on Unit 2. The addition of these valves to the tables impose surveillance requirements and operability requirements for the new valves.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The system operates in the same manner as before except that the air supply to the SRVs is via two separate headers instead of one, and no new failure mode is introduced. The same degree of containment isolation is provided. Each pneumatic supply line will have two containment isolation valves, the same number as for the single supply line. The proposed changes are not expected to (1) increase the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident previously evaluated. The division of the single pneumatic header into two headers is expected to better assure that some of the SRVs will continue to have a functional pneumatic supply system following an accident. This should increase the margin of safety provided by the safety relief system.

On the basis of the above, the Commission has determined that the requested amendments meet the three criteria and therefore has made a

proposed determination that the amendment application does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Attorney for licensee: G.F. Trowbridge, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Nebraska Public Power District, Docket No. 50-298, Cooper Nuclear Station, Nemaha County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: May 31, 1985, as supplemented August 21, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) to reflect the addition of a halon fire suppression system and fire detectors to the service water pump room at Cooper Nuclear Station. In particular, the TS would be modified to include limiting conditions for operation (LCO) and surveillance requirements for the halon system in Section 3.4.17 and to add the service water area fire detectors to the list of plant fire detectors in Table 3.14. The halon system and fire detectors were installed in the service water pump room to justify an exemption from the requirements of Appendix R to 10 CFR Part 50. The exemption was requested by the licensee in a letter dated June 28, 1982 because of the inadequate separation between redundant service water pumps. The addition of the halon system and fire detectors was found acceptable and the exemption was granted by NRC letter dated September 21, 1983. *Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:*

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration, i.e., example (ii), is "A change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications; for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement." The current Cooper Technical Specifications do not include operability nor surveillance requirements for the service water halon system or additional fire detectors. Therefore, the proposed amendment to add these requirements is encompassed by example (ii) above. The Commission, therefore, proposes to determine that this action involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room

location: Auburn Public Library, 118 15th Street, Auburn, Nebraska 68305.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. G. D. Watson, Nebraska Public Power District, Post Office Box 499, Columbus, Nebraska 68601.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Northern States Power Company,
Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear
Generating Plant, Wright County,
Minnesota

Date of application for amendment:
August 30, 1984, as revised November 8,
1984 and August 29, 1985.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment will change the Technical Specifications (TS) to incorporate the changes in the radiation monitoring requirements due to installation of Reactor Building Vent Wide Range Gas Monitors (RBV-WRGM) and to incorporate miscellaneous administrative changes. The changes are as follows:

(1) TS 3.2/4.2 and 3.8/4.8 are changed to clear up confusion associated with cross reference to the Reactor Building Vent (RBV) Plenum Monitors and RBV-WRGM. The RBV plenum monitor will be associated with isolation functions for an accident whereas, the newly installed RBV-WRGM will be associated with isolation functions for routine releases.

(2) A footnote is added to Table 4.8.1, "Radioactive Liquid Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements" reflecting the existing calibration source requirements for the discharge canal radiation monitors and the future calibration source requirements, if the canal radioactivity monitors should ever be replaced. In addition, to avoid confusion between "effluent releases" and "liquid radwaste releases," word changes are made to Table 3.8.1, "Radioactive Liquid Effluent Monitoring Instrumentation."

(3) To clarify the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCOs) in TS 3.8/4.8, Radioactive Effluents, certain paragraphs are moved from the Surveillance Requirements column to the LCO column without any change to the wording.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The changes proposed in Item No. (3) clarify the Radioactive Effluents LCO and Surveillance Requirements and avoids confusion. Some paragraphs have been moved from the Surveillance Requirements column to the LCO column. There is no change in the wordings or the requirements. For these reasons, the staff, therefore, proposes

that the change would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the possibility or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The changes proposed in Item No. (1) incorporate the changes in the requirements due to installation of RBV-WRGM and to avoid confusion associated with cross-reference to TS 3.2/4.2 and 3.8/4.8. The RBV plenum monitors no longer perform isolation functions for routine releases. The newly installed RBV-WRGM provide enhanced monitorings and calibration features and are superior to the original plenum monitors. These are set in accordance with the methods in the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (ODCM).

The proposed change in the wording to the Technical Specifications clarifies the confusion associated with the function and appropriate setpoint for the RBV plenum monitors and the RBV-WRGM. All currently specified setpoints are preserved. For these reasons, the staff, therefore, proposes that the change would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the possibility or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

In Item No. (2) above, the added footnote reflects the existing calibration source requirements for the discharge canal radiation monitors and its future calibration source requirements, as permitted by the existing TS, if the canal radioactivity monitors should ever be replaced. The footnote states that there is a correlation between the original liquid source and the current solid source in the instrument calibration and also recognizes, that, should the canal radioactivity monitors ever be replaced, their detector response and system efficiency shall be equal to or better than the present system and met present day calibration requirements. Thus, for these reasons, the staff concludes that the proposed change in Item No. (2) above would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the possibility or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, based on the reasons as described above, the staff has made a proposed determination that the

application involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Environmental Conservation
Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300
Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald
Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and
Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, NW.,
Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B.
Vassallo.

Northern States Power Company,
Docket No. 50-263, Monticello Nuclear
Generating Plant, Wright County,
Minnesota

Date of application for amendment:
September 14, 1984.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed amendment would reflect the changes in the revised Section of 10 CFR 50.72, and a new Section, 10 CFR 50.73, both of which became effective on January 1, 1984. The revised subsection 50.72 modifies the immediate notification requirements for operating nuclear power reactors and subsection 50.73 provides for a revised Licensee Event Report System.

The proposed changes are in the "Definitions" and "Administrative Control" sections of the Technical Specifications. The definition "Reportable Occurrence" is replaced by a new term "Reportable Event." A new requirement is added for the Safety Audit and Operations Committee to review all reportable events and special reports. A new position of "Assistant to the Plant Manager" is added with no other organizational changes involved. The title of "Director of Nuclear Generation" is changed to "Vice President Nuclear Generation." An additional Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) in the control room is added to comply with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.54(m)(2).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include example (vii)—change in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations. The "reporting changes" proposed in the application for amendment are fully encompassed by this example because the license is being changed solely to conform with a change in the

regulations. The licensee was requested by the NRC staff to make these administrative changes in Generic Letter No. 83-43, "Reporting Requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, subsections 50.72 and 50.73, and Standard Technical Specifications," dated December 19, 1983. The presence of an additional SRO in the control room also falls in this category since the proposed change satisfies the requirements of § 50.54(m)(2) of 10 CFR Part 50.

The changes in the titles and a new position in the plant organization without any other organizational changes are strictly of an administrative nature. For these reasons, the staff, therefore, proposes that the changes would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the possibility or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

Therefore, since all of the changes are encompassed by examples of changes which the Commission has determined are not likely to pose a significant hazards consideration, the staff proposes to determine that the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Environmental Conservation Library, Minneapolis Public Library, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Omaha Public Power District, Docket No. 50-285, Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1, Washington County, Nebraska

Date of amendment request: September 6, 1985, as supplemented September 3, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would authorize changes to the Fort Calhoun Station, Unit No. 1 Technical Specifications which are required to support the operation of the unit at full rated power during Cycle 10. Specifically, the following specifications are proposed to be changed: minimum departure from nucleate boiling (DNB) ratio, total planar radial peak, total integrated radial peak, and reactor cold leg temperature. In addition, the licensee proposes to incorporate the axial shape index as an input to the Thermal Margin/Low Pressure Trip Function and

to use a mini-CECOR/Better Axial Shape Selection System (BASSS) for incore monitoring of the linear heat rate and DNB LCOs. Because these specifications are proposed to be changed, the following figures would be changed: Thermal Margin/Low Pressure Safety Limit, Thermal Margin/Low Pressure Limiting Safety System Settings, Limiting Condition for Operation for Excore Monitoring of Linear Heat Rate, and F_{T_n} and $F_{T_{ex}}$ and Core Power Limitations.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The licensee has presented its discussion of significant hazards considerations pursuant to 10 CFR 50.92 in regard to the above proposed technical specification changes. The licensee's discussion is based upon an in-depth Cycle 10 reload evaluation which was submitted with the application for amendment. The licensee states that (1) the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated are not increased because all events/accidents not enveloped by Cycle 9 parameters were evaluated and shown to have acceptable consequences, with violation of no safety limits; (2) the Cycle 10 reload does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated because the core loading utilizes fuel management techniques which have previously been proven acceptable, and (3) the Cycle 10 core reload does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety because the Cycle 10 reload evaluation, which uses NRC approved methodologies, demonstrates that the margin of safety is maintained in the revised Technical Specifications limits. The staff has reviewed the licensee's significant hazards considerations determination for the technical specification changes and, based upon this review, the staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: W. Dale Clark Library, 215 South 15th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68102.

Attorney for licensee: LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby, and MacRae, 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher, Acting.

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Dockets Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: May 23, 1980, as amended by letters dated August 1, 1980, June 2, 1981, April 4, 1983, May 29, 1984, and April 24, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendments would: (1) Change the title of the off-site safety review organization from "Operation and Safety Review Committee" to "Nuclear Review Board", (2) designate the "Superintendent, Nuclear Services" as the alternate to the "Superintendent, Nuclear Generation Division" in lieu of the "Superintendent, Fossil-Hydro Generation Division", (3) change the title of "Superintendent, Generation Division—Nuclear" to "Superintendent—Nuclear Generation Division", (4) revise the management organization chart to reflect the formation of a new position of Manager, Nuclear Production, and (5) redefine the reporting schedule for the Nuclear Review Board and Safety Limit Violation Report. This change would define the reporting schedule as "10 working days" rather than "14 days" as currently specified in the Technical Specifications (TSs). This change would establish consistency with the reporting requirements of Section 6.9.2 of the Peach Bottom TSs.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazard consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: (i) A purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error or a change in nomenclature.

The proposed changes identified in items (3) and (5) above are purely administrative changes as in example (i) since they involve a change in nomenclature and result in achieving consistency throughout the TSs.

The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists [10 CFR 50.92(c)]. A proposed amendment to an operating license for a facility involves no significant hazards considerations if operation of the facility

in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed changes to Section 6 (Administrative Controls) described in items 1, 2, and 4 above are the result of the creation of a new review organization for the the Peach Bottom facility. The creation of the Nuclear Review Board (item 1) to replace the current Operation and Safety Review Committee permits the utilization of personnel with experience and expertise at both the Peach Bottom and Limerick Nuclear facilities. The Board will perform the safety review functions at Peach Bottom without changing the current functions of the Operational and Safety Review Committee as described in the current TSs.

In addition, further organization changes have resulted in the creation of the position "Superintendent, Nuclear Services" (item 2). The licensee indicates that the proposed change, including the assignment of responsibilities, would enhance the effectiveness of the Nuclear Generation Division in responding to safety issues at Peach Bottom. In a similar manner, organizational changes have resulted in the creation of a position, "Manager, Nuclear Production," which will focus separate management attention on nuclear activities (item 4 above). Based upon the above, the Commission's staff believes that these proposed changes are administrative improvements and that these changes will not diminish, in any way, current administrative requirements of the Peach Bottom TSs. The staff, therefore, proposes to conclude that the proposed amendments to the Peach Bottom TSs involving Section 6 (Administrative Controls) would not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (2) create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. On this basis, the staff has made an initial determination that the proposed amendments are not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Government Publications
Section, State Library of Pennsylvania,
Education Building, Commonwealth and

Walnut Streets, Harrisburg,
Pennsylvania.

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner,
Jr., 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

**Philadelphia Electric Company, Public
Service Electric and Gas Company,
Delmarva Power and Light Company,
and Atlantic City Electric Company,
Dockets Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach
Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units
Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania**

Date of amendment request: May 4,
1983, as supplemented November 10,
1983, and November 29, 1984.

Description of amendment request:
The application requests revisions to the
Technical Specifications (TSs)
concerning reactor system coolant
leakage monitoring. This application
was previously noticed on April 5, 1984
(49 FR 13612). This new notice pertains
to a revised amendment request dated
November 29, 1984. Specifically, this
application requested the following: (1)
A change in nomenclature from "Air
Sampling System" to "Drywell
Atmosphere Radioactivity Monitor" to
clarify the parameter being monitored;
(2) elimination of Table 3.2.E
(Instrumentation That Monitors Drywell
Leak Detection) to remove redundancy
in the TSs; (3) a change in limiting
condition for operation (LCO)
requirements from a 7-day to a 30-day
LCO together with the addition of grab
sample surveillance requirements in the
revised Section 3.6.C.3; and (4) revisions
to TS Bases supporting these changes.
The November 29, 1984, letter also
withdraws certain requests involving
the proposed deletion of specific testing
and surveillance requirements
concerning the Drywell Atmosphere
Radioactivity Monitor Systems.

**Basis for proposed no significant
hazards consideration determination:**
The Commission has provided guidance
concerning the application of the
standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing
certain examples (48 FR 14870). One of
the examples (i) of an action involving
no significant hazards considerations is
a purely administrative change to
Technical Specifications; for example, a
change to achieve consistency
throughout the Technical Specifications,
correction of an error, or a change in
nomenclature.

The proposed change pertaining to
renaming the "Air Sampling System" the
"Drywell Atmosphere Radioactivity
Monitor" is purely a change in
nomenclature as in example (i) above.
Thus, this proposed change conforms to
the above example for which no
significant hazards considerations exist.

The Commission has provided
standards for determining whether a
significant hazards consideration exists
[10 CFR 50.92(c)]. A proposed
amendment to an operating license for a
facility involves no significant hazards
considerations if operation of the facility
in accordance with the proposed
amendment would not (1) involve a
significant increase in the probability or
consequences of an accident previously
evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a
new or different kind of accident from
any accident previously evaluated; or (3)
involve a significant reduction in a
margin of safety.

The request for deletion of Table 3.2.E
will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in
the probability or consequences of an
accident previously evaluated because
the requirements currently contained in
this Table would now be fully addressed
in the proposed revised Section 3.6.C
(Coolant Leakage);

(2) Create the possibility of a new or
different kind of accident from any
accident previously evaluated because
the specific monitoring functions
currently indicated in Table 3.2.E will
still be performed under the proposed
revised Section 3.6.C; or

(3) Involve a significant reduction in a
margin of safety because the required
functions of Table 3.2.E would now be
specified in Section 3.6.C.

The request to change the LCO
requirements for the Drywell
Atmosphere Radioactivity Monitor from
7-days to 30-days in the event the
system is inoperable (and the TS Bases
supporting these changes) will not:

(1) Involve a significant increase in
the probability or consequences of an
accident previously evaluated because
the new specifications would also add
the requirement of using grab sampling
at least every 24 hours while the system
is inoperable as a means of monitoring
drywell air radioactivity which is in
accordance with the Standard Technical
Specifications for Boiling Water
Reactors;

(2) Create the possibility of a new or
different kind of accident from any
accident previously evaluated because
the radioactivity monitoring function
would be accomplished by the proposed
grab sampling, and reactor coolant
system leakage surveillance as specified
in Section 3.6.C.1 would still be
undertaken by the requirements of
Section 3.6.C.2 (Coolant Leakage—
Containment Sump and Flow Monitoring
System); or

(3) Involve a significant reduction in a
margin of safety because the proposed
change in the LCO from 7 to 30 days

would be accompanied by the additional requirement of performing grab sampling every 24 hours which is also consistent with the provisions outlined in the Standard Technical Specifications for Boiling Water Reactors.

Therefore, since the application for amendments involves changes that are similar to examples for which no significant hazards consideration exists, or has been determined on a case by case basis that no significant hazards consideration exists, the Commission's staff has made a proposed determination that the application for amendments involves no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Education Building, Commonwealth and Walnut Streets, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Philadelphia Electric Company, Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Atlantic City Electric Company, Dockets Nos. 50-277 and 50-278, Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units Nos. 2 and 3, York County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: July 17, 1985.

Description of amendment request: These proposed amendments request that bypassing scram signals which are the result of main steam line isolation valve (MSIV) closure or main condenser low vacuum be permitted when the reactor mode switch is not in the RUN position. Modifications to the Reactor Protection System would be made to accomplish this. The current Technical Specifications (TSs) permit bypassing when the mode switch is not in the RUN position and reactor pressure is less than 600 psig. This proposed amendment request also would add to Tables 3.2.A (Instrumentation That Initiates Primary Containment Isolation) and 4.2.A (Minimum Test and Calibration Frequency for Primary Containment Isolation Systems) limiting conditions for operation (LCO) and surveillance requirements for certain instruments. These additional requirements are being proposed because the instruments which provided the inputs for the Reactor Protection System scram signals, as described above, and which are proposed to be bypassed, also provide input into the Primary Containment Isolation System for control of the isolation valves for the feedwater flush system.

Finally, the proposed amendments request that obsolete footnotes be deleted since applicable modifications and testing referenced in these footnotes have been completed.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards consideration include: (i) A purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications; for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the Technical Specifications, correction of an error or a change in nomenclature; and (ii) a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction or control not presently included in the Technical Specifications.

Example (i) encompasses the changes requested to delete obsolete footnotes since the licensee indicated that the modifications and testing programs referenced in these footnotes have been completed. Example (ii) applies to the change request which would add LCOs and surveillance requirements to the Primary Containment Isolation Systems (Tables 3.2.A and 4.2.A) for Reactor Pressure (Feedwater Flush System Interlock) instruments.

The Commission has provided standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists (10 CFR 50.92(c)). A proposed amendment to an operating license to a facility involves no significant hazards consideration if operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not: (1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed amendment request to permit bypassing the scram signals which are the result of MSIV closure or main condenser low vacuum while not in the RUN mode differs only from the existing TS requirements by removing the current TS pressure restriction ("... reactor pressure less than 600 psig"). The licensee maintains in its submittal that operation difficulties with an earlier BWR type (BWR-1) resulted in the addition of scram logic to prohibit operation above 600 psig while not in the RUN mode with MSIVs closed. Subsequent to establishing these restrictions on BWR-1s and some later BWR-4s (e.g., Peach Bottom), the reactor

vendor (General Electric tested a BWR-4 configuration operating in the "bottled-up" condition (MSIV closed) and concluded that there are no unacceptable operating regions when a BWR-4 reactor was "bottled-up" at pressures well in excess of 800 psig (GE Report No. NEDO-20697, "Bottled-up Operation of a BWR", November 1974). These data were presented as part of a TS amendment application submitted by TVA for Browns Ferry, Unit 3 (a BWR-4) on January 23, 1984. The Commission's staff approved the TVA request to permit the bypassing of the scram systems which are the result of MSIV closure or main condenser low vacuum except in the RUN mode (August 27, 1984). A survey of other BWR-4s by the staff indicates that the above pressure restrictions are not present.

In summary, the existing scrams delineated in the Peach Bottom TSs are already bypassed (when the reactor mode switch is not in the RUN position) except when reactor pressure is greater than 600 psig, and test data referenced above indicate that there is no need for this pressure restriction on BWR-4s. Therefore, the Commission's staff finds that: (1) The probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident would not be increased above those analyzed in the Final Safety Evaluation Report (FSAR) because the proposed removal of the pressure restrictions appear not to affect any safety system setting applicable to BWR-4s; (2) the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from those analyzed in the FSAR would not result from this change because technical data appear to support the conclusion that the above cited pressure restrictions are not needed and were never needed in BWR-4s; and (3) the margin of safety would not be significantly reduced because the removal of these pressure restrictions would not appear to result in any unacceptable operating conditions since BWRs can be controlled adequately in the "bottled-up" condition at pressure greater than 600 psig.

Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine that the above proposed changes to the TSs involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Education Building, Commonwealth and Walnut Streets, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Attorney for licensee: Troy B. Conner, Jr., 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Portland General Electric Company, et al., Docket No. 50-344, Trojan Nuclear Plant, Columbia County, Oregon

Date of amendment request: August 7, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The proposed amendment would add operability and surveillance requirements for the core exit thermocouples and the Reactor Vessel Level Instrumentation System to Tables 3.3-11 and 4.3-7, respectively.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards considerations determination: The Commission has provided guidance to the NRC staff concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazard exists by providing examples of amendments that are not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). One such example is (ii), a change that constitutes an additional limitation, restriction, or control not presently included in the technical specifications. The proposed changes are in response to post-TMI requirements for Item ILF.2 of NUREG-0737, and appear to be consistent with the model technical specifications issued in NRC Generic Letter 83-37. As such, these changes are encompassed in example (ii) and constitute additional controls which will assist the operators in monitoring plant parameters and in mitigating the consequences of an accident. Therefore, the staff proposes to determine that the application for amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Multnomah County Library, 801 S.W. 10th Avenue, Portland, Oregon.

Attorney for licensee: J.W. Durham, Senior Vice President, Portland General Electric Company, 121 S.W. Salmon Street, Portland, Oregon 97204.

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher, Acting.

Power Authority of the State of New York, Docket No. 50-286, Indian Point Unit No. 3, Westchester County, New York

Date of amendment request: May 17, 1985 as supplemented August 9, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The changes to the Security Plan revise the table of the management organization to include certain title changes; remove and replace out-of-date document references with current references to the guard training and qualification plan; extend certain construction completion dates which fall due during an outage; to document changes to locations of the perimeter fence; clarify additional upgrades to the

intrusion detection/CCTV system, and provide additional details on the special security measures at the condensate polisher building and intake structures.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Our evaluation of change concludes that the licensee has provided equivalent or improved measure for all of the changes. Therefore, we conclude that a no significant hazards consideration finding is appropriate because (1) the proposed changes do not constitute a significant hazards consideration as defined by 10 CFR 50.92; (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the proposed changes; and (3) this action will not result in a condition which significantly alters the impact of the station on the environment, as described in the NRC Environmental Impact Statement.

Local Public Document Room location: White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10601.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Charles M. Pratt, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, New York 10019.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendments request: August 6, 1985.

Description of amendments request: The amendments request would change Section 4.6.1.3, Containment Air Lock Surveillance Requirements, to read:

a. "By pressurizing the volume between the airlock door gaskets to equal to or greater than 10.0 psig and checking for an extrapolated** seal leak rate equal to or less than 0.01 L_a.

1. After each opening, except when used for multiple entries; then at least once per 72 hours.

2. After performing maintenance which could affect the airlock door gaskets sealing capability.

3. Prior to establishing containment integrity,

b. By conducting an overall air lock leakage test at design pressure (47.0 psig) and verifying the overall air leakage rate is within its limit:

1. At least once per six months#.

2. Prior to establishing containment integrity when maintenance that could affect the airlock sealing capability was performed and the maintenance affects components other than the door gaskets,* and

c. At least once per 6 months by verifying that only one door in each air lock can be opened at a time.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing certain examples (48 FR 14870). This change corresponds to examples (i) and (ii) of the guidance provided in Federal Register 14870 by the Commission for Amendments That Are Considered Not Likely To Involve Significant Hazards Considerations. The change to Unit No. 1 constitutes an addition of a more stringent surveillance requirement [example (ii)] and the change conforms to example (i) for both Salem units in that it is an administrative change that achieves consistency between the Salem Technical Specifications and NUREG 0452, Standard Technical Specifications for Westinghouse Pressurized Water Reactors. Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that the changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Salem Free Library, 122 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08709.

Attorney for licensee: Conner and Wetterhann, Suit 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Public Service Electric and Gas Company, Docket Nos. 50-272 and 50-311, Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendments request: August 6, 1985.

Description of amendments request: The proposed amendments would revise Surveillance Requirement 4.8.2.3.e for both Salem units. This change will remove the requirement for performing two separate tests of the batteries during certain plant shutdowns and allow the satisfactory performance of the more stringent of the two tests to satisfy the surveillance requirements for both the 18 month and the 60 month tests on those occasions where the 60 month test is performed.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Battery Capacity Discharge Test, the 60 month test, demonstrates the battery is still within acceptable limits relative to its original design. This test also demonstrates, unless a significant change to the DC system has been made during subsequent plant operation (and

that change would have been evaluated in terms of 10 CFR 50.59), that the battery can also satisfy the original design duty cycle, which is the purpose of the 18 month test.

Therefore, the proposed change in testing would have no appreciable impact on the operability of the batteries. There would be no significant increase in the probability or consequences of any accident previously analyzed, there would be no new accident created for which no analysis was performed, and no margin of safety would be significantly reduced. Therefore the staff proposes to determine that these changes involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Salem Free Library, 122 West Broadway, Salem, New Jersey 08079.

Attorney for licensee: Conner and Wetterhann, Suite 1050, 1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation,
Docket No. 50-244, R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Wayne County, New York

Date of amendment request: July 19, 1985.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Ginna Technical Specifications to remove an inconsistency regarding the quality assurance (QA) record retention requirements. Section 6.10.1 indicates that a number of records of QA activities required by the Operational Quality Assurance Manual (OQAM) "shall be retained for at least 5 years." The inconsistency is that item 1 of Section 6.10.2 requires that records of QA activities required by the OQAM (i.e., these same records) "be retained for the duration of the Unit Operating License."

In light of the above, the NRC staff recommended that the words "not listed in Section 6.10.1" be added to item 1 of Section 6.10.2 of the Ginna Technical Specifications. RG&E responded accordingly with the proposed amendment request.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of the standards in 10 CFR 50.92 by providing certain examples of actions not likely to involve a significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). One of the examples (i) relates to purely administrative changes to technical specifications: for example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correct errors, or change nomenclature. The proposed

change would clarify a potential inconsistency in quality assurance records retention requirements.

Based on the above, since the proposed change involves actions that conform to example (i), the staff proposes to determine that this application for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Rochester Public Library, 115 South Avenue, Rochester, New York 14610.

Attorney for licensee: Harry H. Voigt, Esquire, LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby and MacRae, 1333 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100, Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District,
Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of amendment request: April 25, 1985 and June 20, 1985.

Description of amendment request: These submittals revise and supplement the request for amendment dated May 31, 1984, as supplemented July 31 and August 31, 1984, which was noticed in the Federal Register on November 21, 1984 (49 FR 45963). The April 24, 1985 submittal revises the effective period for the license condition proposed in the May 31, 1984, submittal and revises the Living Schedule Plan to modify some of the methods for accommodating changes to establish schedules. The June 20, 1985, submittal provides additional information on the plan and procedures for preparation of the Living Schedule. The submittal does not change the license condition.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance for the application of the standards for determining whether a significant hazards consideration exists by providing examples of amendments that are considered not likely to involve significant hazards consideration (48 FR 14870). One of the examples of actions involving no significant hazards considerations relates to a purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications. Revising the effective period of the proposed license condition does not change our conclusion that the incorporation of a license condition requiring the use of a plan to provide for scheduling modifications and notification of scheduling changes is purely administrative. Modifying of the methods for accommodating changes to established schedules and providing additional information do not change

the proposed license condition or the Technical Specifications.

Therefore, since the application for amendment as revised and supplemented still involves proposed changes that are similar to an example for which no significant hazards consideration exists, the staff has made a proposed determination that it involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Sacramento City-County Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, California.

Attorney for licensee: David S. Kaplan, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, P.O. Box 15830, Sacramento, California 95813.

NRC Branch Chief: John F. Stolz.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri

Date of application for amendment: August 12, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The purpose of the proposed amendment request is to revise Technical Specification Figure 6.2-2 to reflect an organizational title change from Supervisor, Radwaste to Superintendent, Radwaste.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: On April 6, 1983, the NRC published guidance in the Federal Register (48 FR 14870) concerning examples of amendments that are not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. This amendment request is similar to the example of a purely administrative change to the technical specifications. The proposed organizational title change involves a minor revision to a previously submitted and approved Operations Radwaste Organization, does not involve a change in reporting relationships, does not involve a change in job responsibilities, and does not involve a change in minimum qualification requirements. Based on the above, the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
locations: Fulton City Library, 709 Market Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251 and the Olin Library of Washington University, Skinker and Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: B. J. Youngblood.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-483, Callaway Plant, Unit 1, Callaway County, Missouri

Date of application for amendment: August 13, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The purpose of the proposed amendment is to revise Technical Specification 4.7.10.1.2.c to allow the 18-month inspection of the fire pump diesel engines to be performed when the plant is at power, instead of only when the plant is shutdown.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Callaway Plant's fire suppression water system has three 1500 gpm pumps. Two are diesel-driven and one has an electric drive. Per Technical Specification 3.7.10.1 and the system design, only two fire suppression pumps are required to meet the Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) for all modes of operation. Therefore, taking one diesel-driven pump out-of-service for inspection of the engine is consistent with the LCO in all modes of operation.

Appropriate action statements are provided in the event the LCO cannot be met. On April 6, 1983, the NRC published guidance in the Federal Register (48 FR 14870) concerning examples of amendments that are not likely to involve significant hazards considerations. This amendment request is similar to the example of a purely administrative change to the technical specifications; specifically a change to achieve consistency throughout the specifications. Based on the above, the requested amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room locations: Fulton City Library, 709 Market Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251 and the Olin Library of Washington University, Skinker and Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: B.J. Youngblood.

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation, Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of application for amendment: May 10, 1985.

Description of amendment request: This proposed change would revise the Vermont Yankee Technical Specifications (TS), Figures 3.6.1, 3.6.2 and 3.6.3 (Pages 111, 111a and 111b) and correspondent bases pages (Pages 117 and 118) to incorporate shifts in the

Vermont Yankee reactor vessel pressure/temperature limit curves.

This change would adjust the curves of Figure 3.6.1 to compensate for the effects of increased neutron exposure to permit operation to a cumulative energy output of 1.790E8 MWh(t). This adjustment is necessary because the existing curves are limited to an energy output of 1.33E8 MWh(t), a value which is expected to be reached during May 1986. This change would also adjust the curves of Figures 3.6.1 and 3.6.2 to incorporate revised fast neutron fluence calculations.

A revision to Appendix G of 10 CFR Part 50, which became effective July 26, 1983, required that all reactor vessel pressure/temperature limit curves include additional safety margins for the closure flange region of the vessel. Subsequently, on February 7, 1984, the licensee submitted a change to reflect the additional Appendix G requirements as they applied to the licensee's May 26, 1983 submittal. On March 13, 1984, the staff issued Amendment No. 81 to the Vermont Yankee Facility Operating License. This amendment revised the Vermont Yankee TS in response to the licensee's letter of May 28, 1983 to accommodate shifts in transition temperature for the reactor pressure vessel materials that were induced by radiation effects, as required by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G. However, Amendment No. 81 did not incorporate the revised reactor vessel pressure/temperature curves submitted by letter dated February 7, 1984. The new curves submitted with this proposed change supersede those previously submitted.

The reactor vessel pressure/temperature curves submitted by letter dated February 7, 1984 have been revised based upon the results of the 10-Year Surveillance Capsule Report, prepared by Battelle Laboratories. Pursuant to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix H, Reactor Vessel Material Surveillance Program Requirements, the licensee submitted Battelle Report BCL-585-84-3, "Final Report on Examination, Testing and Evaluation of Irradiated Pressure Vessel Surveillance Specimens From the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station." This report documented the analysis performed on the surveillance specimen removed from the Vermont Yankee reactor vessel during the 1983 refueling outage.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for conclusions regarding "Significant Hazards Consideration" (48 FR 14870). The examples of actions involving no significant hazards

consideration include: "A change to make a license conform to changes in the regulations, where the license change results in very minor changes to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations" (example vii).

This change to the pressure/temperature limits is similar to the example cited above because 10 CFR Part 50, Appendices G and H require the updating of pressure/temperature limits based on the surveillance program. This proposed change will result in a change to facility operations clearly in keeping with the regulations.

Based on the above, the staff proposes to determine that the requested action would involve no significant hazards considerations.

Local Public Document Room location: Brooks Memorial Library, 224 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vermont 05301.

Attorney for licensee: John A. Ritscher, Esquire, Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Branch Chief: Domenic B. Vassallo.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of amendments request: August 6, 1985.

Description of amendments request: The proposed change would eliminate the NA-1&2 TS 6.5.3.(n) which is redundant to several other requirements listed in TS 6.5.3.1. TS 6.5.3.1 specifies various audits which the Quality Assurance (QA) Department is required to maintain on NA-1&2 station activities. Presently included within the scope of TS 6.5.3.1 are TS 6.5.3.1.(l) and 6.5.3.1.(m) which require the QA Department to audit the Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (ODCM) and Process Control Program (PCP) (including implementing procedures) at least every 24 months. Also, TS 6.5.3.1(n) specifies an audit of activities required by Regulatory Guide 1.21, Revision 1, June 1974, and Regulatory Guide 4.1, Revision 1, April 1975, at least once per 12 months.

Provisions contained in Regulatory Guide 1.21 (Revision 1-June 1974) and Regulatory Guide 4.1 (Revision 1-April 1975) were used by the licensee in developing the ODCM and PCP. Copies of the ODCM and PCP were included in the licensee's submittal for the NA-1&2 Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications (RETS) and were found to be acceptable. Changes to these documents require approval of the NA-1&2 Station Nuclear Safety and

Operating Committee (SNSOC) and submittal to the NRC in the Semiannual Radioactive Effluent Release Report for the period in which any change was made.

The Implementing procedure for the ODCM and the PCP contain QA Program requirements as specified in the licensee's Nuclear Power Station QA Program. The ODCM and PCP and associated implementing procedures are audited as required by TS 6.5.3.1(l) and (m) to ensure compliance with the licensee's Nuclear Power Station QA Manual.

The above referenced programs and procedures constitute the QA Program which implements the applicable provision of the Regulatory Guides referenced above. The proposed changes would increase the audit frequency of the ODCM and PCP (including implementing procedures) from 24 months to twelve months for TS 6.5.3.1(l) and (m) and delete the redundant audit requirement specified in TS 6.5.3.1(n).

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: The Commission has provided guidance concerning the application of standards for determining whether a proposed action involves a significant hazards consideration by providing certain examples (See 48 FR 14870). Example (i) states: "A purely administrative change to technical specifications: For example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature." The proposed changes fall within the envelope of example (i) since the proposed change would eliminate a redundant requirement and provide greater consistency. Accordingly, the Commission proposes to determine this change involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Board of Supervisors Office, Louisa County Courthouse, Louisa, Virginia 23093 and the Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901.

Attorney for licensee: Michael W. Maupin, Esq., Hunton, Williams, Gay and Gibson, P.O. Box 1535, Richmond, Virginia 23212.

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher, Acting.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-280 and 50-281, Surry Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, Surry County, Virginia

Date of amendment requests: August 9, 1985.

Description of amendment requests: This amendment would revise the surveillance requirements for safety-related shock suppressors (snubbers) by: (1) Deleting the snubber listings (Tables 4.17-1 and 4.17-2), (2) revising Specifications 4.17A and 4.17B to reduce the frequency of visual inspections, and (3) revising the Bases for 4.17 to include the definitions of accessible and inaccessible snubbers, and to establish snubber inspection groups based on design and application. The deletion of the snubber listings from the Technical Specifications (TS) is executed as a consideration of Generic Letter (GL) 84-13.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: Consistent with the Commission's criteria for determining whether a proposed amendment to an operating license involves no significant hazards consideration, 10 CFR 50.92 (48 FR 14870), the proposed revisions to the surveillance requirements of snubbers would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated; or involve a significant reduction in margin of safety.

The Commission stated in GL 84-13 that a snubber listing within the TS was not necessary provided the TS are modified to specify which snubbers are required to be operable. Since this proposed change shifts the location of the snubber listing (Tables 4.17-1 and 4.17-2) from the TS to an administratively controlled listing and does not eliminate the requirement to inspect the snubbers, this proposal meets the three criteria stated above.

The proposed revisions to reduce the frequency of visual inspections, and the establishment of snubber inspection groups based on design, application, and accessibility may result in some increase to the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated or may reduce in some way a margin of safety. However, the magnitude of these effects would not be significant and would remain within all acceptable criteria. Thus, these proposals meet the three criteria stated above.

As such, the staff proposes to determine that the proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Swem Library, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia 23185.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. Michael W. Maupin, Hunton and Williams, Post

Office Box 1535, Richmond, Virginia 23213.

NRC Branch Chief: Steven A. Varga.

Yankee Atomic Electric Company, Docket No. 50-29, Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Franklin County, Massachusetts

Date of amendment request: May 26, 1981, as revised January 23, 1984 and February 26, 1985.

Description of amendment request: Amendment 83 to the Yankee Nuclear Power Station Technical Specifications (TS) was issued July 1, 1985, and addressed a majority of the proposed changes requested in the May 16, 1981 and January 23, 1984 letters. A portion of the proposed changes were not covered by the initial notice in the Federal Register March 27, 1985 (50 FR 12168). These remaining proposed changes are (1) removal of one valve from the Emergency Core Cooling System (ECCS) surveillance requirements, (2) modification of the operability requirements for the high pressure carbon dioxide system to allow maintenance in Manhole No. 3, (3) changes to the Radioactive Effluent TS to require operability of certain systems only for conditions where flow exists in the systems, and (4) change the special sampling requirements for tritium radioactive gaseous waste.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination:

(1) The requested TS change proposes to remove one of the charging header/loop #4 Hot Leg Injection Long-Term Recirculation valves from the TS. Current TS require the valve to be open with power to the valve operator removed. Modifications to the ECCS recirculation system have excluded the valve from the hot leg injection and the ECCS recirculation flow path. Thus, the valve is no longer required to be open to ensure hot leg ECCS injection or recirculation.

(2) The high pressure CO₂ system is currently required to be operable whenever equipment within the protected area is required to be operable. The requested TS change proposes to allow an exception to this requirement by allowing the automatic initiation of the high pressure CO₂ system to be disabled during maintenance activities, provided a continuous fire watch is established and the high pressure CO₂ system remains capable of being manually initiated. The protection afforded by the high pressure CO₂ system will, therefore, remain intact. The proposed change is in keeping with the current requirement to

have a continuous fire watch if the CO₂ system is inoperable.

(3) Radioactive effluent composite samplers and flow measurement devices are currently required to be operable at all times. The requested TS change proposes to require these systems to be operable only when there is flow in the applicable effluent pathway. Due to the design of these samplers and devices, they can only be checked and calibrated if flow exists. The proposed change makes the TS consistent with the physical capabilities of these systems.

(4) The requested TS change proposes to delete the requirement to sample gaseous effluent for tritium following a thermal power change. Since the tritium is not affected by thermal power changes, sampling for this isotope will reveal nothing about a change in effluents caused by the power change. Sampling will continue to be required monthly by grab sample, and is performed continuously in the stack sampling system.

Based on these discussions, the proposed changes would not: (1) involve any significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The staff therefore proposes to determine that the requested actions would not involve a significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Greenfield Community College,
1 College Drive, Greenfield,
Massachusetts 01301.

Attorney for licensee: Thomas Dignan,
Esquire, Ropes and Gray, 225 Franklin
Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02110.

NRC Branch Chief: John A. Zwolinski.

Wisconsin Electric Power Company,
Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point
Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2,
Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc
County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: August 8,
1985.

Description of amendment request:
The amendment request would revise
the Technical Specifications to add
additional surveillance requirements for
reactor trip breakers. The amendment
would also add reference to
maintenance of sampling and analysis
equipment as part of the Post Accident
Sampling Program and correct two
typographical errors.

*Basis for proposed no significant
hazards consideration determination:*
The Commission has provided guidance
concerning the application of standards
for determining whether an action

involves a significant hazards
consideration by providing certain
examples (48 FR 14870). Two of the
examples of actions not likely to involve
significant hazards considerations are
example (i), a purely administrative
change to technical specifications and
example (ii), a change that constitutes
an additional limitation, restriction or
control not presently in the technical
specifications.

The proposed license amendment
contains changes that fall into these two
categories. Correction of two
typographical errors and addition of a
reference to maintenance of sampling
and analysis equipment as part of the
Post Accident Sampling Program are
purely administrative changes.
Surveillance requirements for reactor
trip breakers constitute additional
controls not presently in the technical
specifications.

Based on the above, the staff proposes
to determine that the amendments do
not involve a significant hazards
consideration.

Local Public Document Room
location: Joseph P. Mann Public Library,
Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald
Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts &
Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W.,
Washington, D.C. 20036.

NRC Branch Chief: Edward J. Butcher,
Acting.

PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED NOTICES OF CONSIDERATION OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS TO OPERATING LICENSES AND PROPOSED NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION DETERMINATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING

The following notices were previously
published as separate individual
notices. The notice content was the
same as above. They were published as
individual notices because time did not
allow the Commission to wait for this bi-
weekly notice. They are repeated here
because the bi-weekly notice lists all
amendments proposed to be issued
involving no significant hazards
consideration.

For details, see the individual notice
in the *Federal Register* on the day and
page cited. This notice does not extend
the notice period of the original notice.

Commonwealth Edison Company,
Docket No. 50-373, La Salle County
Station, Unit 1, La Salle County, Illinois

Date of amendment request: July 15,
1985 as supplemented by letters dated
August 9, and 12, 1985.

Brief Description of amendment: The
amendment would extend on a one-
time-only basis for a limited number of

the surveillance requirements in the La
Salle Unit 1 Technical Specifications
which must be performed every 18
months and which can only be done
when the plant is shutdown. Since the
La Salle Unit 1 has been through an
extended startup program and has been
shutdown for various reasons over the
past months, the core has not been fully
utilized. Therefore, the licensee
rescheduled the refueling outage from
September 22, 1985 to October 27, 1985
in order to operate the plant to extend
the useful core life. Upon startup, this
temporary extension will expire.

*Date of publication of individual
notice in Federal Register:* August 21,
1985 (50 FR 33875).

Expiration date of individual notice:
September 20, 1985.

Local Public Document Room
location: Public Library of Illinois Valley
Community College, Rural Route No. 1,
Oglesby, Illinois 61348.

Union Electric Company, Docket No. 50-
483, Callaway Plant, Unit No. 1,
Callaway County, Missouri

Date of amendment request: July 10,
1985 as supplemented by letter dated
August 9, 1985.

Description of amendment request:
The purpose of the proposed
amendment is for an extension of the
initial 18-month surveillance interval for
manual initiations of the reactor trip
system and engineered safety features
actuation system (ESFAS), portions of
diesel generator testing, ESFAS
actuators on safety injection and loss
of offsite power, containment spray
actuation test-ing, phase A and B
containment isolations, and class 1E
battery service test.

*Date of publication of individual
notice in Federal Register:* September 3,
1985 (50 FR 35626).

Expiration date of individual notice:
October 3, 1985.

Local public document room
locations: Fulton City Library, 709
Market Street, Fulton, Missouri 65251
and the Olin Library of Washington
University, Skinker and Lindell
Boulevards, St. Louis, Missouri 63130.

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

During the period since publication of
the last bi-weekly notice, the
Commission has issued the following
amendments. The Commission has
determined for each of these
amendments that the application
complies with the standards and
requirements of the Atomic Energy Act
of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the

Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the *Federal Register* as indicated. No request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene was filed following this notice.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendments, (2) the amendments, and (3) the Commission's related letters, Safety Evaluations and/or Environmental Assessments as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document rooms for the particular facilities involved. A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

Boston Edison Company, Docket No. 50-293, Pilgrim Nuclear Power Station, Plymouth, Massachusetts

Date of application for amendment: April 15, 1983, as revised May 14, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment incorporates revised radiological effluent and environmental monitoring limiting conditions for operation, action statements, and surveillance requirements.

Date of issuance: August 30, 1985.

Effective date: March 1, 1986.

Amendment No.: 89.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-35. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: August 23, 1983 (48 FR 38390) and July 3, 1985 (50 FR 27503).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 30, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Plymouth Public Library, North Street, Plymouth, Massachusetts 02360.

Carolina Power & Light Company, Docket No. 50-325, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Unit 1, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendment: April 30, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications (TS) to revise TS Table 3.6.3-1 to reflect modifications being made during the current refueling outage to provide a dedicated purge system for post-accident combustible gas control.

Date of issuance: September 10, 1985.

Effective date: September 10, 1985.

Amendment No.: 91.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-71. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 19, 1985 (50 FR 25483) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 10, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Southport, Brunswick County Library, 109 W. Moore Street, Southport, North Carolina 28461.

Carolina Power & Light Company, Docket Nos. 50-325 and 50-324, Brunswick Steam Electric Plant, Units 1 and 2, Brunswick County, North Carolina

Date of application for amendment: June 18, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments change the Technical Specifications to delete the requirements for radioactivity monitors on individual branches of the Reactor Building Component Cooling Water (Service Water) System.

Date of issuance: September 3, 1985.

Effective date: September 3, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 90 and 115.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-71 and DPR-62. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 31, 1985 (50 FR 31066) The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Southport, Brunswick County

Library, 109 W. Moore Street, Southport, North Carolina 28461.

Carolina Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-261, H. B. Robinson Steam Electric Plant, Unit No. 2, Darlington County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendment: February 7, 1984 as supplemented by letters dated July 20, 1984 and January 31, 1985 which are superseded by letter dated May 2, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A of the Facility Operating License and revises paragraphs 3B and 3G of the Facility Operating License in compliance with NUREG-0737 and guidance of Generic Letter 83-37.

Date of issuance: August 29, 1985.

Effective date: August 29, 1985.

Amendment No.: 94.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-23. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications and Facility Operating License.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: This amendment request was initially noticed on May 23, 1984 (49 FR 21826). The initial amendment request was supplemented and finally superseded by letter dated May 2, 1985. The May-2, 1985 request was renoticed on May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20972). The May 2, 1985 letter, however, was inadvertently identified as April 30, 1985 in 50 FR 20972.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 29, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Hartsville Memorial Library, Home and Fifth Avenues, Hartsville, South Carolina 29535.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut

Date of application for amendment: October 20, 1981.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the technical specifications to delete the logic requirement of pressurizer low-level for a safety injection trip. Previously, pressurizer water level coincident with pressurizer pressure trip was necessary for initiation of safety injection, which is less stringent than the current condition for low pressurizer pressure trip actuation of safety injection. Deletion of the pressurizer level from actuation logic for safety injection maintains the more conservative logic requirements as

requested by IE Bulletin 79-06A (Revision 1).

Date of issuance: September 3, 1985.

Effective date: September 3, 1985.

Amendment No. 65.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-61. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 26, 1983 (48 FR 49580). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room
location: Russell Library, 124 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: May 2, 1983.

Description of amendment request: This amendment modifies the Technical Specifications to: (1) Add post-accident instrumentation heading to Section 3 and 4 of the index; (2) add new limiting conditions for operation and surveillance requirements for post-accident instrumentation and, (3) add requirements for a special report if post-accident instrumentation is unavailable.

Date of issuance: September 3, 1985.

Effective date: September 3, 1985.

Amendment No. 66.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-61. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: October 26, 1983 (48 FR 49581). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room
location: Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: May 31, 1984.

Brief description of amendment request: This amendment modifies the Technical Specifications to change the discharge pressure requirements for ECCS periodic flow testing to reflect true pump performance with allowance for ECCS pump degradation due to normal wear.

Date of issuance: September 3, 1985.

Effective date: September 3, 1985.

Amendment No. 67.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-61. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 12, 1984 (48 FR 28484). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room
location: Russell Library, 124 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50-213, Haddam Neck Plant, Middlesex County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: May 29, 1985 superseding the January 18, 1979 submittal.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment approves technical specifications for radiological effluent monitoring which incorporate the requirements of Appendix I to 10 CFR Part 50 into Appendix A, "Technical Specifications," and deletes Appendix B, "Environmental Technical Specifications."

Date of issuance: September 5, 1985.

Effective date: September 5, 1985.

Amendment No. 68.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-61. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications and the license.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 17, 1985 (50 FR 29008). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room
location: Russell Library, 124 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06457.

Consumers Power Company, Docket No. 50-255, Palisades Plant, Van Buren County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment: March 29, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment deletes Technical Specifications 4.13 that required neutron noise monitoring to confirm that the modification made in 1974 to change the core barrel in place was adequate.

Date of issuance: September 5, 1985.

Effective date: September 5, 1985.

Amendment No. 91.

Provisional Operating License No. DPR-20. The amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 23, 1985 (50 FR 16002). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 5, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room
location: Van Zoeren Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Duquesne Light Company, Docket No. 50-334, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit No. 1, Shippingport, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: December 12, 1984 and revised by letter dated June 27, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications for Beaver Valley Unit No. 1 to impose requirements to protect the reactor coolant system from overpressure events under low temperature conditions. The revised technical specifications comply with the guidelines contained in Standard Review Plan Section 5.2.2, "Overpressure Protection" and Branch Technical Position RSB 5-2, "Overpressurization Protection of PWRs While Operating At Low Temperatures".

Date of issuance: September 6, 1985.

Effective date: September 6, 1985.

Amendment No. 96.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-49. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: February 27, 1985 (50 FR 7986) and July 31, 1985 (50 FR 31068).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 6, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room
location: B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Dockets Nos. 50-321, and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: October 1, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revise the Environmental Technical Specifications (Appendix B) to delete the requirement for aerial photography which has been employed to determine the effects of cooling tower drift on the surrounding environment.

Date of issuance: September 9, 1985.

Effective date: September 9, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 115 and 56.

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-57 and NPF-5. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: March 27, 1985 (50 FR 12143). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301, City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket Nos. 50-321 and 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Units Nos. 1 and 2 Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: March 11, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications to delete dates for completion of environmental qualification of equipment that have been superseded by the regulations (10 CFR 50.49).

Date of issuance: September 9, 1985.

Effective date: September 9, 1985.

Amendments Nos.: 114 and 54.

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. DPR-57 and NPF-5. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 4, 1985 (50 FR 23548).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: February 15, 1985, as supplemented May 14, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to change the pressure alarm setpoint for the hydraulic control units and the identification number for the automatic depressurizer timer.

Date of issuance: September 9, 1985.

Effective date: September 9, 1985.

Amendment No.: 55.

Facility Operating Licenses No. NPF-5. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 4, 1985 (50 FR 23548). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al., Docket No. 50-289, Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: March 5, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment incorporates editorial changes to GPU's submittal dated February 17, 1984, dealing with shock suppressors (snubbers) which was issued as Amendment 106 on March 21, 1985.

Date of issuance: September 9, 1985.

Effective date: September 9, 1985.

Amendments No.: 110.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-50. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 23, 1985 (50 FR 16005). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Government Publications Section, State Library of Pennsylvania, Education Building, Commonwealth and Walnut Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: June 24, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The NRC staff in NUREG 0737 Item III.D.1.1 required the establishment of the leakage reduction program outlined in Technical Specification 6.8.4a. This change to the Technical Specifications adds the Residual Heat Removal and Post Accident Sampling Systems to the listing of "Primary Coolant Source outside Containment" in Technical Specification 6.8.4a in order to complete the listing and accurately reflect that contained in the FSAR Section 18.1.69.

Date of issuance: September 16, 1985.

Effective date: Upon issuance.

Amendments Nos.: 49 and 17.

Facility Operating Licenses Nos. NPF-14 and NPF-2-2. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notices in Federal Register: July 31, 1985 (50 FR 31071). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a

Safety Evaluation dated September 16, 1985.

No comments were received regarding the Commission's proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-388, Susquehanna Stream Electric Station, Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: September 25, 1984 as amended on November 12, 1984.

Brief description of amendments: This amendment allows the licensee to physically modify the plant by adding two motor operated valves to the Emergency Service Water (ESW) system return lines from the Unit 2 direct expansion (DX) units. This physical plant modification is reflected in Technical Specification Table 3.8.4.2-1 which shows the addition of two motor operated valves in the ESW system.

Date of issuance: September 4, 1985.

Effective date: 90 days from the date of issuance.

Amendments No.: 15.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-22. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notices in Federal Register: December 31, 1984 (49 FR 50818). The Commission's related evaluation of this amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1985.

No comments on the proposed determination were received.

Local Public Document Room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Docket No. 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2, Luzerne County Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: April 9, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment changes the Technical Specifications to permit Susquehanna SES refueling operations (fuel) loading and unloading to take place without using Fuel Loading Chambers (FLCs). This change allows up to eight fuel assemblies to be loaded in order to attain the required Technical Specification count rate on the source

range monitors (SRMs) without creating any safety concern.

During the Susquehanna SES Unit 1 end-of-cycle defueling, the FLCs, which were being used to provide neutron monitoring, produced anomalous reading which were attributed to a detector saturation condition caused by the high gamma flux from the irradiated fuel. The same problem will be experienced during the upcoming Unit 2 refueling outage since PP&L plans to offload the entire core as they did during the Unit 1 refueling outage.

In order to assure a safe subcritical condition during the loading of the first eight fuel assemblies (2 assemblies per SRM) the licensee has performed calculations assuming maximum reactivity conditions (i.e., cold, clustered, uncontrolled, peak reactivity) which concluded that eight fuel assemblies, as analyzed, would remain subcritical. These calculations were bounding for all the fuel to be used during the Susquehanna SES Unit 2 Cycle 2.

During a typical core reloading, two irradiated fuel assemblies will be loaded around each SRM to produce greater than the minimum required count rate. The loading schemes will be selected to provide for continuous multiplying medium to be established between the required operable SRMs and the location of the core alteration to enhance the ability of the SRMs to respond to the loading of each fuel adjacent to the SRMs.

Date of issuance: September 4, 1985.

Effective Date: Upon issuance.

Amendment No.: 16.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-22: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Dates of initial notices in Federal Register: July 17, 1985 (50 FR 29013). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 4, 1985. The Commission has made a proposed no significant hazards consideration determination and has received no comments on such finding.

Local Public Document room location: Osterhout Free Library, Reference Department, 71 South Franklin Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18701.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of application for amendment: September 20, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the TSs to (1) change the name of the Reactor Building

Stack, Auxiliary Building Stack, Reactor Building Service Area Vent and the Radwaste Service Area Vent Particulate Monitors to Particulate Samplers, (2) change the name of the Radwaste Service Area Iodine monitor to Iodine Sampler, and (3) delete the source check, instrument channel calibration and the channel check for these instruments.

Date of issuance: August 30, 1985.

Effective Date: August 30, 1985.

Amendment No.: 73.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-54: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Dates of initial notices in Federal Register: April 23, 1985 (50 FR 16012). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated August 30, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Sacramento City-County Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, California.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of application for amendment: October 29, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications defining the testing requirements for those pressurizer heaters powered from Class 1E power sources.

Date of issuance: September 9, 1985.

Effective date: September 9, 1985.

Amendment No.: 74.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-54: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: June 4, 1985 (50 FR 23550). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Sacramento City-County Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, California.

Sacramento Municipal Utility District, Docket No. 50-312, Rancho Seco Nuclear Generating Station, Sacramento County, California

Date of application for amendment: October 29, 1984.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revised the Technical Specifications defining fire hose acceptability and corrects certain

inconsistencies in reporting requirements.

Date of issuance: September 9, 1985

Effective date: September 9, 1985

Amendment No.: 75

Facility Operating License No. DPR-54: Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: May 21, 1985 (50 FR 20988). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Sacramento City-County Library, 828 I Street, Sacramento, California.

Tennessee Valley Authority, Docket Nos. 50-327 and 50-328, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Hamilton County, Tennessee

Date of application for amendments: May 21, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments change the Technical Specifications to delete references to three loop power operations.

Date of issuance: September 3, 1985.

Effective date: September 3, 1985.

Amendment Nos.: 41 and 33.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-77 and DPR-79: Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 31, 1985 (50 FR 31072). The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Chattanooga-Hamilton County Bicentennial Library, 1001 Broad Street, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37401.

Virginia Electric and Power Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-338 and 50-339, North Anna Power Station, Units No. 1 and No. 2, Louisa County, Virginia

Date of application for amendments: March 11, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the NA-1&2 TS by reducing the boron concentration in the boron injection tank and concentrated boric acid system. The minimum required boric acid concentration for the boron injection tank and the boric acid system was revised from a range of 11.5% to 13.0% (by weight) to a range of 7.4% to 9.0% (by weight). In addition, the minimum boric acid tank temperature was revised from 145°F to 155°F. Finally, the minimum boric acid tank inventory for both NA-1&2 was increased from

4,200 gallons to 6,000 gallons. These changes will reduce maintenance problems and the associated personnel radiation exposure.

Date of issuance: September 9, 1985.

Effective date: Within 30 days from the date of issuance.

Amendment Nos: 68 and 54.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-4 and NPF-7. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: April 23, 1985 (50 FR 15997 at 16019).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 9, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room locations: Board of Supervisors Office, Louisa County Courthouse, Louisa, Virginia 23093, and the Alderman Library, Manuscripts Department, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22901.

Wisconsin Electric Power Company, Docket Nos. 50-266 and 50-301, Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2, Town of Two Creeks, Manitowoc County, Wisconsin

Date of application for amendments: April 26, 1985.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications to remove the restrictions on movement of loads over the spent fuel pool following crane modification to meet the single failure criteria of NUREG-612. Surveillance requirements for the auxiliary building crane have also been revised to reflect crane upgrades to meet single failure criteria and to delete limit switch inspection criteria previously in the Technical Specifications. Limit switches to restrict movement over the spent fuel pool were removed following the NUREG-612 crane upgrades.

Date of issuance: September 3, 1985.

Effective date: September 3, 1985.

Amendment Nos: 96 and 100.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-24 and DPR-27. Amendments revised the Technical Specifications.

Date of initial notice in Federal Register: July 31, 1985 (50 FR 31061 at 31077).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1985.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Local Public Document Room location: Joseph P. Mann Library, 1516

Sixteenth Street, Two Rivers, Wisconsin.

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE AND FINAL DETERMINATION OF NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION AND OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING (EXIGENT OR EMERGENCY CIRCUMSTANCES)

During the period since publication of the last bi-weekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Because of exigent or emergency circumstances associated with the date the amendment was needed, there was not time for the Commission to publish, for public comment before issuance, its usual 30-day Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment and Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination and Opportunity for Hearing. For exigent circumstances, a press release seeking public comment as to the proposed no significant hazards consideration determination was used, and the State was consulted by telephone. In circumstances where failure to act in a timely way would have resulted, for example, in derating or shutdown of a nuclear power plant, a shorter public comment period (less than 30 days) has been offered and the State consulted by telephone whenever possible.

Under its regulations, the Commission may issue and make an amendment immediately effective, notwithstanding the pendency before it of a request for a hearing from any person, in advance of the holding and completion of any required hearing, where it has determined that no significant hazards consideration is involved.

The Commission has applied the standards of 10 CFR 50.92 and has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. The basis for this determination is contained in the documents related to this action. Accordingly, the amendments have been issued and made effective as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these

amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.12(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment, (2) the amendment to Facility Operating License, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment, as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., and at the local public document room for the particular facility involved.

A copy items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Licensing.

The Commission is also offering an opportunity for a hearing with respect to the issuance of the amendments. By October 25, 1985, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) The nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be

made a party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than fifteen (15) days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter, and the bases for each contention set forth with reasonable specificity. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

Since the Commission has made a final determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, if a hearing is requested, it will not stay the effectiveness of the amendment. Any hearing held would take place while the amendment is in effect.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last ten (10) days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at (800) 325-6000 (in Missouri (800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number 3737 and the following message

addressed to (Branch Chief): petitioner's name and telephone number; date petition was mailed; plant name; and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Executive Legal Director, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555, and to the attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board designated to rule on the petition and/or request, that the petitioner has made a substantial showing of good cause for the granting of a late petition and/or request. That determination will be based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

Carolina Power & Light Company,
Docket No. 50-324, Brunswick Steam
Electric Plant, Unit 2, Brunswick County,
North Carolina

Date of application for amendment:
August 28, 1985, as supplemented
August 29, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment changes the Technical Specifications to allow the isolation time for the inboard high pressure coolant injection (HPCI) steam line isolation valve to be increased from 50 to 55 seconds on a temporary basis until the next reload, at which time the valve will be repacked.

Date of issuance: September 3, 1985.
Effective date: September 3, 1985.
Amendment Nos.: 116.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-62. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment and final determination are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1985.

Attorney for licensee: George F. Trowbridge, Esquire, Shaw Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Local Public Document Room location: Southport, Brunswick County Library, 109 W. Moore Street, Southport, North Carolina 28461.

Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of application request: August 30, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: It consists of changes to the Technical Specification setpoint for automatic transfer of the reactor core isolation cooling pump suction from the condensate storage tank (CST) to the suppression pool on low CST water level.

Date of issuance: September 11, 1985.
Effective date: September 11, 1985.
Amendment Nos.: 57.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-5. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment and final determination of no significant hazards consideration are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 11, 1985.

Attorney for licensee: G. F. Trowbridge, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Local Public Document Room location: Appling County Public Library, 301 City Hall Drive, Baxley, Georgia.

Indiana and Michigan Electric Company,
Docket No. 50-315, Donald C. Cook
Nuclear Plant, Unit No. 1, Berrien
County, Michigan

Date of application for amendment:
July 30, 1985, as supplemented by letters dated August 8, 1985 and two letters dated August 13, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the Technical Specifications to reflect revised setpoints in the channels for overpower delta T, overtemperature delta T, and loss of the flow trips and the reactor coolant temperature to protect against departure from nucleate boiling (DNB). The licensee submittals of August 8, 1985 and August 13, 1985 were made to clarify the language of the original submittals and provide specific values for the Technical Specifications and do not contain substantive changes.

Date of issuance: September 3, 1985.
Effective date: September 3, 1985.
Amendment No.: 91.

Facility Operating License No. DPR-58. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: Yes. 50 FRN 31447 dated August 2, 1985.

Comments received: No.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated September 3, 1985.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 1800 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Local Public Document Room location: Maude Reston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St. Joseph, Michigan 49085.

Washington Public Power Supply System, Docket No. 50-397, WNP-2, Richland, Washington

Date of amendment request: July 17 and 19, 1985.

Brief description of amendment: This amendment revises the WNP-2 license by modifying the Technical Specifications to add a new Technical Specification Section 3/4.3.10, entitled Neutron Flux Monitoring Instrumentation and supporting licensing bases and modify Technical Specification Section 3/4.4.1 (Recirculation Loops) to permit operation at a higher power level than is currently authorized under Single Loop Operation (SLO). This amendment also corrects page number errors in the Technical Specifications Index.

Date of issuance: September 5, 1985.

Amendment No.: 16.

Effective date: July 19, 1985.

Facility Operating License No. NPF-21. Amendment revised the Technical Specifications.

Public comments requested as to proposed no significant hazards consideration: No.

The Commission's related evaluation is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated July 19, 1985.

Attorney for licensee: Bishop, Liberman, Cook, Purcell & Reynolds, 1200 Seventh Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Local Public Document Room location: Richland Public Library, Swift and Northgate Streets, Richland, Washington, 99352.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 18th day of September 1985.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Edward J. Butcher,
Acting Chief, Operating Reactors Branch #3,
Division of Licensing.

[FR Doc. 85-22841 Filed 9-24-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Statistical Policy Directive on Compilation, Release, and Evaluation of Principal Federal Economic Indicators

AGENCY: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

ACTION: Notice of adoption of a revised Statistical Policy Directive Number 3. The existing directive is entitled "Compilation and Release of Principal Federal Economic Indicators."

SUMMARY: The revised directive clarifies and strengthens Office of Management and Budget guidance to Federal agencies on the compilation and release of principal economic indicators. It includes more stringent procedures for announcing changes in data collection, analysis, and estimation methods, and it adds a new requirement for periodic evaluation of the performance of each economic indicator. The intent of these changes is to ensure that the Federal data and estimates used to assess current economic conditions meet high standards of reliability and usefulness and that agencies release them to the public in a fair and orderly manner. The changes reflect comments by officials of affected agencies on a draft of the revised directive.

BACKGROUND: Statistical Policy Directive Number 3 designates statistical series that provide timely measures of economic activity as Principal Economic Indicators and requires prompt release of these indicators. The intent of the directive is to preserve the time value of such information, strike a balance, between timeliness and accuracy, prevent early access to information that may affect financial and commodity markets, and preserve the distinction between the policy-neutral release of data by statistical agencies and their interpretation by policy officials.

Principal Changes

(1) *Strengthening the language on prompt release.* Economic indicators must be released promptly. Their value as aids for decisionmaking decreases as the time since the end of the reference period increases. Prompt release also reduces the chance of unauthorized, premature disclosure by minimizing the time between the completion of tabulations and the release to the public. The revised directive states that the time between the close of the reference period and the public release date for a series issued quarterly or more

frequently should be at most 22 working days.

(2) *New procedures for announcing the schedule of publication.* The revised directive assigns agencies additional responsibilities for ensuring that users are informed about the release time and date of economic indicators. Each agency must publish a release schedule for each calendar year and individual publications must include an announcement of the next release date and time. These procedures should ensure that agencies announce release dates well in advance and that they routinely provide reminders of the next release date and time to interested users.

(3) *A new requirement that agencies announce planned changes in data collection, analysis, or estimation methods at least three months before implementing the change.* This is to allow users of economic indicators to evaluate, comment upon, and prepare for significant changes in methods or procedures. Users of economic indicators often require a consistent time series for modeling and forecasting. If agencies make modifications, the users must have sufficient time to prepare for the changes and incorporate correction factors. This time period also gives users an opportunity to inform the agency of the effects of a new policy early enough in the planning process so that the agency can consider users' comments.

(4) *New guidance for prerelease access to indicators.* The revised directive clarifies the current provision for making material available to the President through the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers prior to public release. There are new rules for the granting of prerelease access to the press and to policy officials. Agencies must ensure that adequate steps (e.g., sequestering those granted access) are taken to prevent prerelease disclosure or use. So long as there is no risk of prerelease disclosure or use, prerelease access is permitted. Those granted prerelease access must be informed about the conditions surrounding the access.

(5) *New requirement for periodic evaluation of each indicator.* The last section of the directive requires the evaluation of economic indicators every 3 years. These series can have substantial effects upon market decisions and government policy. Periodic evaluation should help ensure that economic indicators continue to meet high standards of accuracy. The required evaluations include an analysis of the accuracy of the series, the effects

of revisions, and performance relative of established benchmarks. The agency that releases each economic indicator will also evaluate release procedures, prerelease security procedures, and the availability and accuracy of documentation. The Office of Management and Budget will review the evaluations to ensure that the releasing agency is adhering to all guidelines. The new requirements replace the informal and highly variable review practices currently in use with uniform evaluation principles and procedures.

The revised directive is published below.

Robert P. Bedell,

Acting Administrator for Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget

Statistical Policy Directive No. 3

Compilation, Release, and Evaluation of Principal Federal Economic Indicators

Statistical series that are widely watched and heavily relied upon by government and the private sector as indicators of the current condition and direction of the economy must meet high standards of accuracy and reliability. Because such data series have significant commercial value, may affect the movement of commodity and financial markets, or may be taken as a measure of the impact of government policies, public release must be prompt and according to an established, publicly available schedule. The purpose of the procedures outlined in this directive is to assure that these data series meet specific accuracy, release, and accountability standards.

1. *Designation of Principal Indicators.* The Administrator for Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, will determine, after consultation with interested Federal agencies, the data series and estimates to be designated as principal Federal economic indicators and covered by this directive. The Administrator will review the designations annually.

2. *Prompt Release.* The interval between the period to which the data or estimates refer and the date when the data or estimates are released to the public shall be as short as practicable. Agencies should compile and release series that are issued quarterly or more frequently within 22 working days of the end of the reference period.

3. *Release Schedule.* The releasing agency is responsible for ensuring that the interested public is aware of the release time and date. The last report of each calendar year must contain the time and date of all reports in the

upcoming year. In addition, each release will include an announcement of the time and date of the next release. The releasing agency shall provide a schedule of releases for the upcoming calendar year to the Statistical Policy Office, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, by December 15. Changes in the release schedule may occur only if special, unforeseen circumstances arise. The releasing agency must announce and fully explain any schedule changes as soon as it has determined they are unavoidable.

There should be one office in the agency that can provide the release schedule of all the agency's economic indicators. The name, address, and telephone number of this office should be readily available to the public. Agencies shall establish and maintain one or two times of day for the release of their principal economic indicators and shall only release indicators at such designated times.

4. *Announcement of Changes.* Agencies shall announce any planned change in data collection, analysis, or estimation methods that may affect the interpretation of a principal economic indicator as far in advance of the change as possible. The agency should include the announcement in a regular report of the economic indicator. When possible, a period of public comment should be provided between the announcement of an intended change and its implementation. At a minimum, for quarterly and monthly series, the agency shall announce the change at least three reports before the first report affected by the change. For weekly and annual series, the announcement should precede the first report affected by the change by at least three months. In the first report affected by the change, the agency should include a complete description of the change and its impact.

Agencies shall fully explain unforeseeable changes due to special circumstances as soon as they are known and in the first report affected by the change.

5. *Release Procedure.* The statistical agency that produces each principal economic indicator shall issue it in a press release or other printed report. The agency shall issue a press release where this will significantly speed up the dissemination of data to the public.

Each statistical agency shall be responsible for establishing procedures to assure that there is no premature release of information or data estimates during the time required for preparation of the public report. This includes the protection of public use data banks, which shall not receive any data or estimates until they are officially

released. As soon as copies of materials for public release have been prepared, the agency shall physically secure them.

Except for the authorized distribution described in this section, agencies shall ensure that no information or data estimates are released before the official release time.

The agency will provide prerelease information to the President, through the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, as soon as it is available. The agency may grant others prerelease access only under the following conditions:

(a) The agency head must establish whatever security arrangements are necessary and impose whatever conditions on the granting of access are necessary to ensure that there is no unauthorized dissemination or use.

(b) The agency head shall ensure that any person granted access has been fully informed of and agreed to these conditions.

(c) Any prerelease of information under an embargo shall not precede the official release time by more than 30 minutes.

(d) In all cases, prerelease access shall precede the official release time only to the extent necessary for an orderly review of the data.

All employees of the Executive Branch who receive prerelease distribution of information and data estimates as authorized above are responsible for assuring that there is no release prior to the official release time. Except for members of the staff of the agency issuing the principal economic indicator who have been designated by the agency head to provide technical explanations of the data, employees of the Executive Branch shall not comment publicly on the data until at least one hour after the official release time.

6. *Preliminary Estimates and Revisions.* Deciding when to release a principal economic indicator requires the balancing of accuracy and timeliness. Agencies should not withhold information needed to evaluate current economic conditions by imposing unnecessarily stringent accuracy requirements on preliminary estimates. However, agencies shall use the following guidelines when issuing and evaluating preliminary data and revisions:

(a) Agencies shall clearly identify figures as preliminary or revised.

(b) Agencies shall only release routine revisions of a principal economic indicator as part of the regular reporting schedule.

(c) If the difference between preliminary and final aggregate figures

is large relative to average period-to-period differences, the agency must either take steps to improve the accuracy of preliminary estimates or delay the release of estimates until a reliable estimate can be made.

(d) If preliminary estimates show signs of a consistent bias (for example, if revisions are consistently in the same direction), the agency shall take steps to correct this bias.

(e) Revisions occurring for routine reasons, such as benchmarking and updating of seasonality factors, shall be consolidated and released simultaneously.

(f) Revisions occurring for other than routine reasons shall be fully explained and shall be released as soon as corrections can be completed.

7. *Granting of Exceptions.* Prior to taking any action that may violate the provisions of this directive, the head of a releasing agency shall consult with the Administrator for Information and Regulatory Affairs. If the Administrator determines that the action is in violation of the provisions of this directive, the head of the releasing agency may apply for an exception. The Administrator may authorize exceptions to the provisions in sections 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of this Directive. Any agency requesting an exception must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Administrator that the proposed exception is necessary and is consistent with the purposes of the Directive.

8. *Performance Evaluation.* Each agency that issues a principal Federal economic indicator shall submit a performance evaluation of that indicator to the Statistical Policy Office, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, every three years. A schedule for the performance evaluation of data series or estimates designated as principal Federal economic indicators will be prepared by the Statistical Policy Office. The evaluation shall address the following issues:

(a) the accuracy and reliability of the series, e.g., the magnitude and direction of all revisions, the performance of the series relative to established benchmarks, and the proportion and effect of nonresponses or responses received after the publication of preliminary estimates;

(b) the accuracy, completeness, and accessibility of documentation describing the methods used in compiling and revising the indicator;

(c) the agency's performance in meeting the designated release schedule and the prompt release objective of this directive;

(d) the agency's ability to avoid disclosure prior to the scheduled release time;

(e) any additional issues that the Administrator for Information and Regulatory Affairs specifies in writing to the agency at least 6 months in advance of the scheduled submission date.

The evaluation will be reviewed by the Administrator to determine whether the indicator is prepared and published in conformity with all OMB statistical policies, standards, and guidelines. A summary of the year's evaluations and their reviews will be included in the annual report to Congress required by section 3514 of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (Pub. L. 96-511).

[FR Doc. 84-22905 Filed 9-24-85; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3110-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. IC-14729; No. 812-5082]

Application and Opportunity for Hearing; Scudder Variable Life Investment Fund, et al.

September 18, 1985.

Notice is hereby given that Scudder Variable Life Investment Fund ("Fund"), Security Equity Life Insurance Company (the "Company"), at Court House Square, P.O. Box 1625, Binghamton, New York, 13902, and Security Equity Variable Life Separate Account (the "Account"), a separate account of the Company, (hereinafter collectively called the "Applicants") filed an application on March 22, 1985, and an amendment thereto on September 12, 1985, requesting an order of the Commission pursuant to section 6(c) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (the "Act") exempting Applicants, separate accounts similarly situated to the Account, and life insurance companies similarly situated to the Company from the provisions of Sections 9(a), 13(a), 15(a), and 15(b) of the Act and Rules 6e-2(b)(15) and 6e-3(T)(b)(15) thereunder to the extent necessary to permit the shares of the Fund to be sold (i) to the Account, other separate accounts of the Company hereafter established to invest in shares of the Fund, and the separate accounts of other life insurance companies ("participating insurance companies"), in connection with the offer and sale of variable annuity contracts ("VA contracts") and variable life insurance policies ("VLI policies") and (ii) to the Company and such other insurance companies in connection with providing initial capital to the Fund for

investment. All interested persons are referred to the application on file with the Commission for a statement of the facts and representations contained therein, which are summarized below, and to the Act and the rules thereunder for the text of the relevant provisions.

Applicants state that the Fund is an open-end diversified management investment company and that Scudder, Steven & Clark will be the Fund's investment adviser. Applicants state that the Fund has been organized as a funding vehicle for variable insurance products to be issued by any insurance company that enters into an appropriate contractual arrangement in that connection. The Company is a New York stock life insurance company, and the Account was registered by the Company as a unit investment trust. With respect to scheduled premium VLI policies offered by the Account, Applicants state that premiums from the policies, after certain deductions, may be allocated to one or more subaccounts of the Account which, in turn, will invest in shares of the appropriate portfolio of the Fund. Applicants further state that in the future, the Company may wish to offer VA contracts or flexible premium VLI policies funded by the Fund. Applicants state that participating insurance companies will establish their own separate accounts as unit investment trusts in accordance with Rule 6c-3 and Rules 6e-2, 6e-3(T), or, when adopted, 6e-3 under the Act, which will fund variable insurance products, and these separate accounts will invest their assets in shares of the Funds.

Applicants state the Rule 6e-2(b)(15) provides, for a separate account registered as a unit investment trust, partial exemptions from sections 9(a), 13(a), 15(a), and 15(b) of the Act, but that these exemptions are available only where all of the assets of the unit investment trust are shares of management investment companies which offer their shares exclusively to variable life insurance separate accounts of the life insurer or of any affiliated life insurance company. Applicants state that this exclusivity requirement relates to the insurance product being offered (thereby prohibiting "mixed funding") and also relates to the entity that is offering the insurance product (thereby prohibiting "shared funding"). Rule 6e-3(T)(b)(15) also has the shared funding limitation. Applicants request exemptive relief with respect to both aspects of the exclusivity requirements; Applicants' proposal involves both mixed funding (it is proposed that the Fund be the